THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

VOL. CXXXVI, No. 4 APRIL, 1957

CONTENTS

The History and Spirit of Holy Week
John H. Miller, C.S.C. 217

The Function of Mariology . . . . *Bernard J. LeFrois, S.V.D.* 242

The Power to Confirm . . . . . *Thomas A. Wassmer, S.J.* 246

Catholics in Colonial America. Part IV . . . *John Tracy Ellis* 265

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS
Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R., and Walter J. Schmitz, S.S.

A Problem in Fasting 275

The Intention in Giving Extreme Unction 276

Circumcision for Medical Reasons 277

Adjustment of Jurisdiction between Church and State 277

Approaching the Altar 279

(Contents Continued on Next Page)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Copyright 1957 by the Catholic University of America Press

(Contents Continued from Preceding Page)

Number of Candles Prescribed 280

Oratio Imperata 280

Holy Communion from Side Altar 280

Exposition Masses 281

Feasts of Saints Peter and Paul 282

Votive Candles 282

BOOK REVIEWS

The Protestant Churches in America, *by J. A. Hardon, S.J.* 283

Transfigured World, *by Sister M. Laurentia, C.S.J.* 284

Holy Week Manual for Servers, *by Walter J. Schmitz, S.S.* 286

In Him Is Life, *by Ernest Mura, F.S.V.* 287

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

Announces

The 25th Anniversary Year of

THE PREACHERS INSTITUTE

JULY 1 TO AUGUST 7, 1957

Director:
Rev. John L. Madden

Fees: Registration $5.00
Tuition $65.00

Sermon building, composition, and rhetoric; the art of expression; emphasis on actual preaching, elimination of defects, development of individual preaching powers; use of recording, television and reproduction techniques.

For complete information write to the

Director of the Summer Session,
The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

THE HISTORY AND SPIRIT OF HOLY WEEK

Now that our Holy Father, Pius XII, has through his supreme authority extended the reform of the Liturgy, so emphatically desired by the Council of Trent, to the rites of Holy Week, it remains to us, grateful and obedient sons of such a provident father, to put to good use the revitalized and repristinized sacramental prayer of Holy Mother Church. This reform, be it noted, far from indulging in a disinterested archeological or antiquarian spirit, bears a marked pastoral quality. Even a cursory reading of the General Decree and Instruction prefixed to the new Holy Week Ordo will bear this out. The Holy See was preoccupied with the sparse number of the faithful who assisted at these sacred ceremonies in the morning hours. In order to make these rites more accessible to a greater number of the laity, they were restored to the evening and afternoon hours. Besides, some of the ceremonies themselves had become so transformed over the years and centuries, that they were but little understood by those not specially trained. Hence, with the advice of experts in the field, the Sacred Congregation of Rites endeavored to bring them back to their native simplicity and symbolism, thus affording the faithful the opportunity of taking part in them more easily, with greater understanding, more devoutly and with more fruit.

The priest, if he is to be a loyal minister of the Church and feed his flock according to the mind of that Church, must be imbued with the true spirit behind her rites and ceremonies. But very often that spirit can be perceived only by means of a correct knowledge of the historical development of the rites in question. To this end the following data is humbly offered.

HOLY WEEK

The importance of Holy Week is brought out by some of the names given it. We find the term "holy week" used already by St. Athanasius in his Festal Letters announcing the date of Easter.[1] It was called "greater week" in Jerusalem towards the end of the

[1] *Epist. festalis,* II, 8. *MPG,* XXVI, 1371.

fourth century.[2] This designation was proper, as St. John Chrysostom remarks,[3] because our Lord has done marvellous things in it. Without doubt this week occupies the chief place in the Liturgical Year, for within it are celebrated the principal mysteries of man's redemption: the Last Supper at which Christ instituted the Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Priesthood, His death on Calvary through which He removed the death of sin and purchased us from the power of the devil, and His resurrection through which He gave us the new life of grace.

In the same way as the Church Year itself grew and developed through the centuries, so in particular did Holy Week enjoy a variety of observances throughout the world in different periods. From earliest times, perhaps already in the days of the Apostles, Friday and Saturday of Holy Week were observed by means of an especially rigorous fast.[4] At a later date still another day was added, Wednesday, the day on which the Jews made their decision to capture and execute Jesus.[5] And by the third century Christians in many localities fasted during the entire week.[6] Not everywhere, however, was Mass offered on all these days.

It is to Jerusalem that we must look for the origin of many of the liturgical specialties of this week. Since it contained so many places sanctified by the memory of our Lord's life, it was only natural that the Christians there should try as best they could to re-enact the more important episodes of Christ's last days on the very spot where they had originally occurred. The pilgrim nun Etheria, who wrote the diary of her travels through Palestine towards the end of the fourth century, has left us a minute description of each day's liturgical ceremonies.[7] From Palestine these rites found their way into the Gallican Liturgy and thence to Rome itself. There they were fused with the already existing Roman Holy Week ritual.

[2] Ethérie, *Journal de Voyage,* n. 30. Edit. Hélène Pétré (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1948), p. 218.

[3] *Homil.* XXX *in Genesim,* 1. *MPG,* LIII, 273-74.

[4] Innocent I, *Epist.* 25, c. 4. *MPL,* XX, 555; Tertullian, *De jejuniis,* 2. *MPL,* II, 1006: *in quibus ablatus est sponsus.*

[5] Peter of Alexandria, *Epistula Canonica,* XV. *MPG,* XVII, 507.

[6] *Apostolic Constitutions,* V, 18. *MPG,* I, 890.

[7] *Journal de Voyage,* nn. 30-38, pp. 218-40.

PALM SUNDAY

In the course of time this Sunday has received many names. The original Roman name for it seems to have been Passion Sunday, simply because the story of the Passion was read on this day.[8] The title Palm Sunday appears already in the Gelasian[9] and Gregorian Sacramentaries,[10] yet the Gelasian still bears the subtitle: *De Passione Domini.* In many Gallican service books the title given this Sunday is *In symboli traditione,*[11] for this was the day on which the catechumens were taught the Creed. The Roman Liturgy finally combined both the commemoration of our Lord's triumphal entry into Jerusalem with the chanting of the Passion, but it left aside for another day during Lent the teaching of the Creed.

There is little doubt today that the procession of palms originated in Jerusalem. Christ's entry into Jerusalem was a fulfillment of a prophecy made in the Old Testament: "Behold thy king shall come to thee, the just and savior; he is poor and riding upon an ass and upon a colt, the foal of an ass."[12] Since the fulfillment of this prophecy was of such great apologetic value, showing as it did that Christ was the promised Messias, the people of the Holy City were led to re-enact the episode. They gathered about their bishop at one o'clock in the afternoon on the Mount of Olives. Having sung hymns, listened to readings of the Old Testament and the Gospel account of our Lord's entry into Jerusalem, at five o'clock the faithful, carrying olive or palm branches, led the bishop, seated on an ass, to the Church of the Resurrection. All the while they chanted psalms and hymns, constantly interspersing the refrain: "Blessed is he who cometh in the name of the Lord!" The service concluded with the singing of Vespers.[13]

It is not certain just when this rite was brought over to the West. Rome knew nothing of it. True, the Gelasian and Gregorian

[8] Cf. e.g., Leo I, *Sermo de passione Domini,* I, 5. *MPL,* LIV, 314.

[9] *The Gelasian Sacramentary.* Edit. H. A. Wilson (Oxford, 1894), p. 60.

[10] *Die älteste erreichbare Gestalt des Liber Sacramentorum anni circuli der römischen Kirche.* Edit. K. Mohlberg (Münster, 1927), p. 22.

[11] E.g., *Missale Gothicum,* XXVII; *Vetus Missale Gallicanum,* XV; the *Bobbio Missal. MPL,* LXXII, 263, 354, 487.

[12] *Zacharias* 9:9.

[13] Etheria, *op. cit.,* n. 31, pp. 220-22.

Sacramentaries contain the title, *Dominica ad palmas,* but this is Palm Sunday in title only, for there is no blessing of palms provided, nor is there any mention of a procession. The presence of such a title in these books remains unexplained.[14] It may be that the very fact that this was the day on which our Lord made His entry into Jerusalem was sufficient to call forth such a title. The fact remains, however, that no trace of any palm ceremony can be found in official Roman service books until the 12th century.[15] It is reasonable to conjecture that the ceremony of blessing of palms and procession made its way to Rome from Gallican lands during the time of the Ottos, just as so many other Gallican elements did.

That these rites existed in the territories using the Gallican liturgy from a relatively early time is beyond doubt. Though Isidore of Seville speaks of the *dies palmarum,* it is not certain that he is really speaking of a liturgical ceremony.[16] The same is true of what the Venerable Bede has to say.[17] The Mozarabic *Liber Ordinum,* which contains traditions of the fifth and sixth centuries, seems to be the first Western service book to describe such ceremonies.[18] After this these rites are clearly attested to in Gaul and Germany by Theofulf of Orleans, who composed the famous hymn, *Gloria, laus et honor* before 821,[19] and by Amalar of Metz, who alludes to a procession of palms.[20] And we find a formula for blessing palms in the seventh century *Bobbio Missal.*[21]

The present rite for the blessing and procession with palms is a simplification of the one which obtained until 1956. In earliest

[14] To say simply that it is due to Gallican influence, as does Noëlle Maurice-Denis Boulet in "Le dimanche des Rameaux," *La Maison-Dieu,* n. 41 (1955), p. 25, does not solve the question. It would make more sense to dub it an interpolation made by Gallican hands.

[15] M. Andrieu, *Le Pontifical romain du* XII[e] *siècle* (vol. I of *Le Pontifical romain au moyen-âge.* 4 vols. Vatican City, 1938-41), pp. 210-14. Boulet, *art. cit.,* p. 27.

[16] *De eccl. off.,* I, 28. *MPL,* LXXXIII, 763.

[17] *Homil.* 23. *MPL,* XCIV, 125.

[18] M. Férotin, *Le Liber Ordinum en usage dans l'Eglise visigothique et mozarabe d'Espagne* (Paris, 1904), col. 73. Boulet, *art. cit.,* p. 22.

[19] *Carmina,* lib. II, 3. *MPL,* 105, 308.

[20] *De off. eccl.,* I, 10. *MPL,* 105, 1008.

[21] *MPL,* LXXII, 572.

times, of course, there was no blessing provided for the palms.[22] It appears for the first time in the above mentioned *Liber Ordinum* of the Mozarabic rite. At the end of the Middle Ages this blessing was removed from the Mass proper. It was, however, desired that the rite resemble a Mass as much as possible, and thus a complete *"Missa sicca"* was developed, that is, a complete Mass-ordinary without consecration. But such a framework for the blessing was certainly not adopted until about the fifteenth century.[23] Unfortunately such an involved rite laid so much emphasis on the palm as a sacramental that the central theme of the rite, the messianic kingship of Christ, was overshadowed. Hence, in the new Holy Week Ordo of Pius XII, the blessing is reduced to a single oration, while everything else centers around the joyous acclamation of Christ the King. And to stress this theme even more, the Ordo prescribes that regal red vestments be worn during the procession and provides many more psalms and antiphons for the singing of the faithful with a messianic content.

After the procession the mood of the celebration changes radically. From the boisterous and joyful acclaim of the Chosen people upon seeing their King we turn to the jeers of a bewildered mob as it decrees the crucifixion of its God. Here the fickleness of the Jews is brought out, but even more the true nature of the Messias is made manifest. According to the prophets the Holy One, the Christ, was to gain His glory through suffering.[24] The joyful red vestments are exchanged for somber violet, and the theme of the Mass proper is the passion of Christ. With this we arrive at the original Roman Liturgy for Palm Sunday, which centers on the reading of the Passion according to St. Matthew. St. Leo I is the earliest witness to this custom. He always explained the Passion of our Lord on this day.[25]

At first the Passion was sung by the Deacon, whose office it was to chant the Gospel. But the length of the Passion as well as the dramatizing tendency of the northern peoples of Europe led already in the tenth century to the practice of having three chanters sing

[22] Etheria, *op. cit.*, n. 31, p. 222.

[23] Odo Casel, "Die Präfation der Palmenweihe," *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft,* II (1922), 107-110.

[24] *Luke* 24: 25-27.

[25] *Sermo de pass. Domini,* I ff. *MPL,* LIV, 314.

it.[26] Rome, however, was slow in accepting this usage. As late as the fourteenth century the Passion was still sung by the Cardinal Deacon alone.[27]

HOLY THURSDAY

The various names given Holy Thursday serve to put in relief its particular theme. From earliest times it has been called *"feria quinta in coena Domini,"* since it principally commemorates the institution of the Holy Eucharist. The same theme is brought out by the title given to it in the Calendar of Polemius Silvius, namely, *"Natalis Calicis."*[28] To bring out the idea that on this day our Lord was betrayed by His trusted disciple Judas and also began to offer Himself, deliver Himself up for the sins of mankind, some called the day the *"dies traditionis."*[29] A common English name for the day is "Maunday Thursday," which is derived from the ceremony of the washing of feet, called in Latin *Mandatum* (commandment), done in imitation of our Lord when He washed the feet of the Apostles, saying to them: "A new commandment I give to you, that you love one another . . ."[30]

Besides commemorating the mystery of the Eucharist and the fraternal love which it ought to beget, Holy Thursday was also the day on which two other ceremonies took place: the reconciliation of penitents and the consecration of Holy Oils. At first sight these ceremonies might seem entirely accidental to the theme of this day. Generally authors give as the reason for holding them today the desire to shorten the Easter Vigil.[31]

Nevertheless, when the Sacrament of Penance is seen as the second gateway to the communion of saints which finds its source in the Eucharistic Sacrifice, it is altogether fitting that this relationship be expressed on the feast of the Holy Eucharist. Our first witness to this union is the letter of Pope Innocent I to Decentius of Gubbio written at the beginning of the fifth century.[32] And the old

[26] H. Thurston, *Lent and Holy Week* (London: Longmans, 1904), p. 230.
[27] *Ordo Rom.* XV, n. 60. *MPL,* LVIII, 1303-1304.
[28] *MPL,* XIII, 678.
[29] Thurston, *op. cit.,* p. 286.
[30] *John* 13:34.
[31] H. Schmidt, "Geist und Geschichte des Gründonnerstags," *Liturgisches Jahrbuch,* III (1953), 243.
[32] *Epist.* 25, c. 7. *MPL,* XX, 559.

Gelasian Sacramentary provides special formulae for this ceremony. According to it, the reconciliation of penitents replaced the normal Foremass, as the following rubric states: *"Eodem die non psallitur, nec salutat, id est non dicit Dominus vobiscum: et Reconciliatio."*[33] After the penitents were reconciled, the Mass proper started with the Offertory.[34] However, by the time of Gregory the Great this rite had already fallen into disuse, for there is no ceremony, no mention of the practice, in the Gregorian Sacramentary.[35]

We must also admit that the consecration of Holy Oils on this Thursday is very appropriate, for it serves to emphasize the fact that all sacraments and blessings flow from the Eucharistic Sacrifice.[36] Of course, this was not always the case. Though a special blessing for oil (apparently oil for the infirm) figures among the other blessings provided for other natural products before the concluding doxology of the Canon of the Mass in the *Apostolic Tradition,*[37] Chrism and the Oil for Catechumens were blessed immediately before the conferring of Baptism.[38] The first trace of all the Oils being consecrated together during the Mass on Holy Thursday appears in the Gelasian Sacramentary.[39] In some places, however, the consecration of Oils took place on other days: the seventh century Parisian Liturgy had it on Palm Sunday, whence the name *Dies unctionis;* St. Cesarius of Arles (d. 542) kept it till the Easter Vigil, the more ancient practice.[40]

Exactly when the consecration of Oils took place in Rome is a problem. Did the ancient Roman Rite have a special Mass for this consecration? We have three documents which profess to offer the Roman usage: the Gelasian Sacramentary, the Gregorian Sacra-

[33] Ed. H. A. Wilson, p. 63.

[34] *Ibid.*, 67.

[35] Ed. K. Mohlberg, pp. 23-24. However, two Mass formularies are provided: one begins with the *communicantes,* and this may possibly be the remnant of the Mass for the reconciliation of penitents; the other formulary is for an evening Mass.

[36] This is, after all, the origin of the *Per quem haec omnia,* as seen in the *Apostolic Tradition:* see following note.

[37] Edited by B. Botte (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1946), n. 5, p. 33.

[38] *Ibid.*, n. 21, p. 49.

[39] Ed. H. A. Wilson, pp. 69-72.

[40] Cf. G. Morin, "Une particularité arlésienne de la liturgie du samedi saint," *Ephemerides Liturgicae,* XLIX (1935), 146-49.

mentary according to the Paduan Codex, and the same Sacramentary as exemplified in the copy sent by Pope Hadrian to Charlemagne. The Gelasian offers us three Masses: one for the reconciliation of penitents, a second for the consecration of Oils, and a third in the evening to commemorate the Last Supper.[41] On the other hand, the Paduan Codex contains the partial formularies of two Masses: one with no special designation and another destined as an evening Mass.[42] Lastly, in the Hadrian text we find but one Mass during which the Oils were consecrated.[43] What are we to make of this?

For the moment let us lay aside the Gelasian Sacramentary, for it is not a completely reliable witness: it has been gallicanized to a high degree.[44] We must take the Paduan Codex and the Hadrian Sacramentary as being the sole secure witness to pure Roman practice. To begin with, a comparison of these two books shows that the one Hadrian Mass is really but a combination of the two Mass formularies appearing in the Paduan Codex. But both of these latter are incomplete. What were they? Schmidt[45] reasons that the first, which lacks the Foremass, is a remnant of the ancient Mass for the reconciliation of penitents, for, as we know, this reconciliation itself took the place of the Foremass. The second formulary of the Paduan Codex bears the title *Item de ipsa die Missa sero*—an evening Mass, and one which lacks its proper ending. Why? A simple explanation is found when we remember that the ritual of the consecration of Oils would naturally take its place.[46] And *de facto,* the Oils were consecrated in the Hadrian Mass which was formed by joining the two partial formularies of the earlier Paduan Codex. Hence, as far as genuine and uncontroverted Roman documents go, we cannot prove that Rome had any more than two Masses on Holy Thursday: one for the reconciliation of penitents,

[41] Ed. H. A. Wilson, pp. 63-73.

[42] E. K. Mohlberg, pp. 23-24.

[43] H. Lietzmann, *Das Sacramentarium Gregorianum nach dem Aachener Urexemplar* (Münster, 1921), pp. 44-47.

[44] Cf. E. Bourque, *Etude sur les sacramentaires romains. Les Textes primitifs* (Vatican City, 1949), p. 225. H. Schmidt goes further and claims that the Gelasian was not an official Roman service book, cf. "De sacramentariis romanis," *Gregorianum,* XXXIV (1953), pp. 725-43.

[45] "Geist und Geschichte des Gründonnerstags," p. 245.

[46] *Ibid.,* p. 246.

another in the evening during which the Oils were consecrated. Finally, when the earlier Roman penitential practice died out, only one Mass was offered, and that in the evening. Therefore, there was no special Mass for the consecration of Oils.[47] But what of the Gelasian Sacramentary and the rites contained therein? Schmidt considers these to be a classic example of how Holy Thursday was observed outside of Rome.[48] If this is true—we do not think Schmidt has proved his point; we simply consider the solution to be highly probable[49]—then we must see in the institution of a special Mass for the consecration of the Oils by the New Holy Week Ordo of Pius XII a re-introduction of a specifically Gallican usage.

The ceremony of the *Mandatum* or the washing of the feet was originally a simple act of charity very common in the Church—especially in monasteries. It was already thus considered by St. Paul, who lists this act among the good works of a saintly widow.[50] The first evidence of its being a liturgical ceremony performed on Holy Thursday is that of the 17th Synod of Toledo, held in 694, which speaks of it as having already fallen into desuetude in some places but desires its restoration.[51] The rite was certainly taken over by Rome by the eleventh century, for at that time we find the Pope washing the feet of twelve subdeacons at the end of the evening Mass.[52] Two centuries later, in addition to this liturgical rite, he also washed the feet of thirteen poor people in his private apartments after the evening Mass.[53] When during the course of the 14th century all the ceremonies were held in the morning hours, the *Mandatum* remained a separate service which usually took place

47 *Ibid.*

48 *Ibid.*, p. 244.

49 He offers no arguments which would show that these three Masses could not have existed in Rome. His conclusion seems based entirely on his assumption that the Gelasian Sacramentary is an out and out Gallican document: see note 44. That this is not a legitimate procedure is seen in the fact that many rites contained in the Gelasian can be proved to be pure Roman practice. Hence, each Gelasian rite has to be examined in itself and not simply brushed aside automatically as Gallican.

50 *I Tim.* 5:10.

51 Can. 3. Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles,* III, 586.

52 *Ordo Rom.* X, n. 12. *MPL,* LXXVIII, 1013.

53 *Ordo Rom.* XII, n. 27. *MPL,* LXXVIII, 1074.

in the afternoon.[54] Pius XII has restored this ceremony to its place of honor in the evening Mass; according to his *Ordo* it comes immediately after the Gospel before the Offertory begins. Thus we are the better able to imitate the ritual of the original Last Supper whereat our Lord washed the feet of His disciples *during* the meal.[55]

During the Mass enough extra hosts are to be consecrated for the general communion on Good Friday. After Mass they are carried in solemn procession to a specially prepared altar and repository. As may be expected, it took time for this arrangement to develop. At first—since the seventh century[56]—the Blessed Sacrament was reserved in the sacristy, and it was brought there in the simplest possible manner. All the earliest references to such reservation on Holy Thursday indicate this by the bald statement: *et reservantur sancta usque in crastinum.*[57] The first trace of a formal procession is found in Jean d'Avranches in the 11th century: *ipsae hostiae a sacerdote et ministris altaris indutis, cum processione, scilicet cum cereis et incenso, super quoddam altare honorifice deportentur, ubi cum nitidissimis linteaminibus optime recondantur.*[58] And this was due to the increasing devotion of the faithful towards the reserved Sacrament. In a short time another influence made itself felt. The allegorists saw in the depositing of the hosts in a special repository a symbol of our Lord's burial, and thus in some countries the repository came to be known as the *sepulcrum.*[59] And there the people kept watch. At first this watch was to last for forty hours and was quite distinct from any eucharistic devotion; it was specifically a watch at the tomb beginning on Good Friday. The desire to keep a full forty hour watch coupled with the development which brought the Easter Vigil farther into the morning hours of Holy Saturday effectively fused two distinct devo-

[54] *Ordo Rom.* XV, n. 65. *MPL,* LXXVIII, 1307.

[55] *John* 13:2 and 12.

[56] Cf. P. Browe, "Die Kommunion an den drei letzten Kartagen," *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft,* X (1930), 70.

[57] *The Gelasian Sacramentary,* ed. H. Wilson, p. 72; the eighth century *Ordo Rom.* XXIII from Einsiedeln, n. 8. M. Andrieu, *Les Ordines Romani du haut moyen-âge.* III (Louvain, 1951), p. 270; and *Ordo Rom.* XXX, n. 25. Andrieu, III, 470.

[58] *De eccl. offic.,* c. 27. *MPL,* CXLVII, 50.

[59] Cf. J. Kettel, "Zur Liturgie des Gründonnerstags," *Liturgisches Jahrbuch,* III (1953), 65-74.

tions into one: veneration for the reserved Sacrament and the Forty Hours Devotion, a pious watch before Christ's tomb.[60]

The idea of the *sepulcrum* was, of course, in sharp conflict with the chronology of these last three days: Christ was not placed in the tomb until the evening of Good Friday after His crucifixion. In time all the funereal[61] processional drama connecting Christ's burial with the solemn reservation of hosts consecrated on Holy Thursday was sharply curbed by the Holy See, and the name *sepulcrum* for the repository was only grudgingly permitted by the Congregation of Rites. The true spirit behind this nocturnal adoration on Holy Thursday is to keep watch—as the Apostles failed to do—with Christ during His long hours of agony before His arrest in the Garden of Olives.

The ceremonies on Holy Thursday are concluded with the stripping of the altars. Although the special ceremony used for this purpose is very expressive of the stripping off of Christ's clothing for the flagellation and crucifixion, it is very probable that it takes its true origin from the simple and regular practice of the early Church of removing the altar cloths after each Mass.

In certain Rites within the Church today, e.g., the Lyonnaise Rite, all priests are permitted to celebrate Mass on this day, not privately, but all together at the same altar and at the same time by means of a true sacramental concelebration. In the Roman Rite, however, even though such a concelebration was provided for on certain more solemn occasions in the Liturgical Year, Holy Thursday was not one of them.[62] The Roman Rite has never shown itself preoccupied with a special celebration of the priesthood on this day. Rather it would seem that it wants to bring out symbolically the fact that at the Last Supper Christ alone offered the Holy Sacrifice. Nevertheless, it is hoped by some[63] that in the future permission for a genuinely sacramental concelebration be granted priests.

GOOD FRIDAY

In the Liturgical books of the Roman Rite this day is called *Parasceve,* or preparation, for it coincides with the Parasceve of

[60] Cf. J. A. Jungmann. "Die Andacht der 40 Stunden und das heilige Grab," *Liturgisches Jahrbuch,* II (1952), 184-98.

[61] *Ibid.,* p. 197.

[62] Cf. *Ordo Rom.* III, n. i. Andrieu, II, 131.

[63] H. Schmidt, "Geist und Geschichte des Gründonnerstags," pp. 249-50.

the Jews, the day of preparation for the great Sabbath. This is a day of great sorrow, *dies amaritudinis,* as St. Ambrose calls it.[64] And this sorrow was expressed by fasting; this indeed was a universal custom.[65] As another expression of this sentiment there existed a universal custom of not celebrating Mass on this day.[66] Some even went so far as to keep their churches closed, a practice which the above mentioned Council of Toledo dubbed as an abuse.[67] Even as now, so in the Middle Ages a discussion arose as to why no Mass was celebrated today, since the days on which the saints died were kept as festivals. Helperich, a monk of the Monastery of St. Gall at the end of the ninth century, replied that Christ, unlike the saints, achieved no greater degree of glory through His death, for He died, not for His own sake, but for ours. The Jews, he said, rejoiced over His death, while the Apostles lamented it.[68]

Once it had become traditional to have some sort of liturgical service in public, it was always held in the afternoon hours. One of the first documents describing the service, *Ordo Romanus* XXIII dating from the eighth century, indicates that the Pope descended from his chambers at two o'clock in the afternoon.[69] This arrangement continued up until the fifteenth century when Amelius still placed the ceremony in the evening.[70] Just after that the ceremony was held in the morning, according to Burchard's Ceremonial which was compiled in 1488.[71] The restoration of this service to its appropriate hours in the afternoon is one of the results of Pius XII's reform.

Three parts make up the Liturgy of Good Friday: (a) a reading service similar to our Mass of the Catechumens, (b) the veneration of the cross, and (c) a communion service.

[64] *Epist.* 23, c. 12. *MPL,* XVI, 1073.

[65] *Ibid.; Apostolic Constitutions,* V, 18. *MPG,* I, 890; IV Council of Toledo of 633, c. 8. *MPL,* LXXXIV, 369.

[66] Inn. I, *Epist.* 25, c. 4. *MPL,* XX, 555. There is no trace of any sacramental celebration before or after this document.

[67] C. 7. *MPL,* LXXXIV, 368.

[68] Cf. Pseudo-Alcuin, *De div. off. MPL,* CI, 1211.

[69] N. 9. Andrieu, III, 270.

[70] *"Sero"* we read in the *Ordo Rom.* XV, n. 75. *MPL,* LXXVIII, 1315.

[71] B. Capelle, "Problèmes de pastorale liturgique: le Vendredi Saint," *Questions Liturgiques et Paroissiales,* XXXIV (1953), 262.

The entire first part is composed of readings, chants and prayers. And this is nothing else than the ancient type of service held on days which were a-liturgical, that is, days on which the Eucharistic Sacrifice was not offered. It is the Service of the Word, originally taken over from the Jewish Sabbath Synagogue service and united, as early as the second century, to the Eucharistic Sacrifice as the part known today as the Mass of the Catechumens. Justin clearly describes it in his *First Apology:* the reading of the commentaries of the Apostles and the writings of the Prophets, a sermon, then the prayers or the *Oratio Fidelium.*[72] Etheria tells us that such a reading service was customary on this day in Palestine. From noon till three o'clock the people of Jerusalem listened to the readings from the psalms, apostles and prophets of whatever concerned our Lord's passion. In between the various readings appropriate prayers were said. And the service ended with the reading of St. John's account of our Christ's dying moment.[73] The thought of the Passion, then, dominated their service just as it does ours today and did throughout the Middle Ages. The long list of orations which terminate this first part is nothing else than the ancient conclusion to the Mass of the Catechumens, spoken of by Justin, and which, though dropped from the ordinary Mass from the time of Pope St. Gelasius on, has been retained in the Liturgy of this one day of the year, in accordance with the law formulated by Anton Baumstark:[74] the law of survival of what is ancient in a liturgical season of high value. Apparently, to judge from the Paduan Codex of the Gregorian Sacramentary,[75] this Service of the Word was the only function held on this day in the early Church.

Upon completing the lengthy solemn Orations, we turn to the unveiling and veneration of the cross, a feature which originated in Jerusalem itself in the fourth century after the discovery of the relics of the true cross by the Empress Helena. There, however, the veneration of the cross took place in the morning hours, according

[72] C. 67. J. Quasten, *Monumenta eucharistica et liturgica vetustissima* (Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1935), p. 19; see also Tertullian, *De anima,* c. 9. *MPL,* II, 701.

[73] *Op. cit.,* n. 37, pp. 236-38.

[74] "Das Gesetz der Erhaltung des Alten in liturgisch hochwertiger Zeit," *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft,* VII (1927), 1, 23.

[75] Ed. K. Mohlberg, p. 24.

to Etheria.[76] The ceremony was quite simple. It took place at Golgotha, where the bishop had his throne especially set up. The relic of the true cross was placed upon a white bedecked table immediately before him, and, as he held his hand upon the relic, the clergy and faithful passed before him to venerate it. As for Rome, a procession started out from St. John Lateran's at two o'clock in the afternoon and headed toward the Basilica of Holy Cross in Jerusalem. The psalm *Beati immaculati in via* was sung as all walked barefoot, the Pope swinging a censer before the relic of the cross all the while. Upon arriving at Holy Cross, the Pope placed the relic on the altar, prostrated himself before it and then kissed it. After him, the clergy did the same. Thereupon it was carried out to the faithful for them to venerate it.[77] The antiphon *Ecce lignum crucis* originally was probably interspersed among the verses of *Psalm* 118 during the opening procession. However, it does not figure in the above described ceremony but is mentioned for the first time in a contemporary (eighth century) document, composed apparently for the churches in the environs of Rome.[78] The Byzantine *Hagios o Theos* and the *Improperia* appear for the first time in the so-called Romano-Germanic Pontifical of the tenth century which was composed at Mainz.[79] Thence these hymns went to Rome and are witnessed to by the Papal Pontifical of the twelfth century, in which also appears for the first time the unveiling ceremony.[80]

A communion service, once called the Mass of the Presanctified, forms the third part of this day's Liturgy. The early Roman Rite evidently knew nothing of Communion on Good Friday; no mention is made of it in documents prior to the eighth century. Of course, the mere silence of the earlier Roman texts does not of itself necessarily disprove the existence of such a practice. Nevertheless, the story which the eighth century service books tell seems to be that the reception of communion on this day had just recently

[76] *Op. cit.*, n. 37, p. 232. The first Roman Ordo which affords us a clear-cut description of pure Roman usage places the veneration of the cross before the reading service: *OR* XXIII, nn. 12-17. Andrieu, III, 270-71.

[77] *Ordo Rom.* XXIII as in note 76.

[78] *Ordo Rom.* XXIV, n. 35. Andrieu, III, 294.

[79] M. Hittorp, *De divinis Catholicae Ecclesiae Officiis* (Rome, 1591), pp. 47-49. B. Capelle, *art. cit.*, pp. 257-58.

[80] Capelle, *art. cit.*, p. 259.

begun in that era, for the Pope still does not receive, nor does anyone else at His official service, but those who wish to do so have to go to the various *tituli* or parish churches.[81] This accords with what Amalar reports in his *De ecclesiasticis officiis*. According to him, when he asked a Roman Archdeacon about the practice of receiving Holy Communion on Good Friday, he was told that no one communicated at the papal service.[82] On the other hand, the Church was evidently anxious to give in to popular piety in this matter and, while not according it an official place in the more prominent papal service, allowed communion to be distributed to the faithful in their parish churches. Thus we find another document of this same eighth century which describes the rites in the titular churches of Rome. In it we find that after the veneration of the cross, or rather while the people were still adoring it, the hosts consecrated the day before were brought unobtrusively to the main altar. After the recitation of the *Pater* together with its embolism, a particle of the large host was mixed with unconsecrated wine and water. Then all communicated in silence.[83]

In the early documents there is no mention of a "mass" of the presanctified. Communion was simply distributed after the traditional communion prayer, the *Pater Noster*. The first time elements of a "dry mass" are found in the Papal Liturgy for this day is in the Roman Pontifical of the twelfth century.[84] After the transfer of the consecrated Host, rubrics indicate that the altar is to be incensed, the prayer *In spiritu humilitatis* is to be said, and the host is broken into three particles. This was unquestionably imported from the Oriental Liturgy to give this part of the service added solemnity and the appearance of a real Mass. This Eastern usage in turn is based on the decree of the Council of Laodicea of 365,[85] repeated by the Council *In Trullo* of 692,[86] according to which the Eucharistic Sacrifice was not to be celebrated on the

[81] *Ordo Rom.* XXIII, n. 22. Andrieu, III, 272.

[82] I, c. 15. *MPL*, CV, 1032.

[83] *Ordo Rom.* XXIV, nn. 36-38. Andrieu, III, 294. Hence, the presence of this well developed communion service in the Gelasian Sacramentary (ed. Wilson, 77) must be a Gallican interpolation.

[84] Capelle, *art. cit.*, p. 259.

[85] C. 49. Hefele-Leclercq, *op. cit.*, I, 1022.

[86] C. 52. Hefele-Leclercq, *op. cit.*, III, 569.

ferial days of Lent. Instead use was to be made of the Mass of the Presanctified.[87]

Once it became customary to distribute communion on Good Friday, the practice was fervently adhered to for centuries. True, already in the Roman Pontifical of the thirteenth century we find the first indication of a change of spirit: *communicat solus pontifex.* Capelle finds the explanation for this in the fact that at this time reception of communion in Rome was very rare.[88] It was at this same period in fact that the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) was forced to make the reception of communion at least once a year during the Paschal season obligatory. Hence, this rubric simply faced up to the situation: people just did not want to receive. Outside of Rome, however, reception of communion on this day continued in full vigor even after it was officially forbidden. In fact, in the seventeenth century Rome had to repeat the prohibition several times! Again we must thank our present Holy Father for restoring to the faithful the opportunity of uniting themselves to their Saviour on the day He gave Himself for their salvation. As history shows, the Holy See, in re-instating general communion on this day, was not guided by antiquarian principles (had she been, she would never have done so, for the early Roman Liturgy knew nothing of it), but rather by genuine pastoral solicitude. At the same time the Holy Week Ritual of Pius XII restores this communion service to its primitive simplicity, removing all the "dry mass" accretions of the late Middle Ages.

HOLY SATURDAY

Even more so than Friday, this day is completely a-liturgical, and traditionally so. Pope Innocent I gives as the reason for no Eucharistic celebration the tradition of the Apostles who spent the day in grief over the death of Christ.[89] In this way the Church shows her desolation and sorrow over her Saviour's death. She keeps the day in quiet mourning, for her Bridegroom has been taken away from her and lies in the tomb. And this is, in point of

[87] Cf. Anton Baumstark's enlightening discussion of this practice: *Liturgie Comparée* (Chevetogne, 1953), pp. 33 and 213.

[88] *Art. cit.*, p. 260.

[89] *Epist.* 25, c. 4. *MPL*, XX, 555.

fact, the theme of Matins for Holy Saturday: Christ's death and burial, His lying in the tomb, the descent into Limbo.

It is with the Easter Vigil that the real Easter Liturgy begins, and in which the entire Liturgical Year and Holy Week reach their climactic zenith.[90] Let us take a rapid look at the preceding days of Holy Week and see how they actually lead up to and find their fulfillment in the Easter Vigil.

On the very first day we hear re-echoed the prophecies of the Messianic King and His glorification through the resurrection. Upon arriving in Jerusalem our Lord went into the Temple and seeing the terrible commercial traffic that went on there overturned the tables of the money-changers and those sellers of doves. When asked by what authority He did this, He answered: "Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up again."[91] This, of course, He said in reference to His death and resurrection. The Epistle of the Mass echoes this same idea in the words of St. Paul: "He humbled Himself becoming obedient unto death, even to the death of the cross. For which reason God has exalted Him and given Him a name which is above all names."[92] And in the collect we pray that we may learn the lessons of His Passion and thus share in the glory of His resurrection. On Monday we read the Gospel account of Christ raising Lazarus from the dead, and in the prayer over the people we beg God to let "us come with joy to the celebration of the great deeds whereby He has made us *new.*" The Introit of Tuesday speaks of the cross of Christ as our "salvation, life and resurrection," while again the prayer over the people speaks of our being cleansed from the weaknesses of sinful nature in order to take part in the divine *renewal.* In the second collect for Wednesday we ask for the grace of the resurrection as the fruit of Christ's passion, and the collect and post-communion on Holy Thursday indicate too that the resurrection and immortality come to us through the cross. Finally, Good Friday itself, though dedi-

[90] For a fuller explanation of this last assertion see John Miller, "The Easter Vigil, Climax of the Week and the Year," *Proceedings of the North American Liturgical Week of 1956.*

[91] *John* 2: 19. The other evangelists make this incident coincide with Christ's triumphal entry into the Holy City: *Matt.* 21: 12-17; *Mark* 11: 15-17; *Luke* 19: 45-46.

[92] *Phil.* 2: 5-11.

cated specifically to the remembrance of the passion, begins with two readings, the first of which describes the mercy of God striking us in order to heal us, quickening us after two days and raising us up on the third to a new life in His eyes; and the second is the account of the Passover meal in Exodus, eaten in preparation for the Passage of the Lord, the deliverance of His chosen people—a figure of the resurrection!

But all these days reach their climax, not on Easter Day, so much as in the Easter Vigil itself. It is obvious that the readings and ceremonies of the Vigil have as their theme our incorporation into Christ through His work of redemption. In the procession with the lighted Paschal Candle we follow Christ in pilgrimage from darkness to light, from death to life, just as the Chosen People followed the column of fire in their passage from slavery to freedom.[93] The magnificent *Exsultet* hymn is a monument to the "night which became radiant as day . . . the truly happy night which alone deserved to know the time and the hour in which Christ rose from the world below . . . the night which frees from the vices of the world and the dark haze of sin all those who believe in Christ, the night which restores us to grace and the fellowship of the saints." And before the great sacrament of resurrection, Baptism, is conferred, or at least before we renew ourselves in the spirit of our Baptismal innocence, we meditate on the Old Testament prophecies which foretold this new life in Christ.[94] And finally we usher in the day of salvation with the sacramental re-enactment and re-offering of the great deed of redemption, the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass.

But why is the year's climax reached only at night?

According to the mind of the ancients, an important feast always began at the vespers of the preceding day. But on this eve the Church is not satisfied to rejoice simply with first vespers; she spends the whole night in prayer, meditation and exultation. She "vigils." She stays awake. As St. Augustine says of this "mother of all Christian vigils,"[95] "we observe the night in which our Lord

[93] Cf. Origen, *Contra Celsum*, 8, 22. *MPG*, XI, 1151.

[94] Cf. Jean Daniélou's three chapters on the Old Testament types of Baptism: *The Bible and the Liturgy* (Notre Dame, Indiana, 1956), 70-113.

[95] *Sermo* 219, *MPL*, XXXVIII, 1088.

arose by watching; we contemplate that life in which there is no death nor sleep, and which Christ began for us in His own flesh by raising it from the dead . . . Nor is it incongruous for us thus to stay awake in vigil: for He slept that we might remain awake, He died that we might live."[96]

But this holy night is not simply commemorative of the past. In Baptism we have not risen to a purely earthly life; the grace which is the principle of our new life in Christ is also the seed of glory. We are called to live in the presence of God in heaven for all eternity. Although we have arisen with Christ to a new life of grace, we still await our ascension into heaven, the consummation of our hope. Hence, the Church has traditionally expected in this night the second coming of Christ, the *Parousia,* in which together with her Spouse she is to begin the eternal day of the nuptial feast. "This is the night," observes Lactantius, "which we celebrate with a night-long vigil because of the coming of our King and God. This night has a twofold significance: in it [Christ] received life after dying, and in the future He will come into possession of the kingdom of the whole world."[97] And St. Jerome after him relates this holy expectation to that of the Jews, who believed that the Messias would come to deliver them during their celebration of the Pasch. For this reason the Christians "held fast to a tradition of apostolic origin that during the Easter Vigil no one was to leave before midnight, for all awaited the coming of Christ. But after the middle of the night, when they felt sure He would not come, they were then to celebrate the feast."[98] And this Jerome writes by way of commentary on that passage in the Gospel: "And at midnight a cry arose: 'Behold, the Bridegroom cometh. Go ye forth to meet him!' "[99]

For several centuries the Church has known the incongruity of celebrating the Easter Vigil—a service whose texts and symbolism obviously call for the night hours—at a very early hour in the morning of Holy Saturday, when Christ certainly had not yet arisen. That this was not always so is proved beyond doubt by historical documents. The *Epistula Apostolorum,* an apocryphal

[96] *Sermo* 221, *MPL,* XXXVIII, 1090.
[97] *De div. instit.,* 7, 19. *MPL,* VI, 796.
[98] *Comm. in evang. sec. Matt.,* lib. IV, c. 25, 6. *MPL,* XXVI, 192.
[99] *Matt.* 25:6.

writing dating from 140 to 160 and coming from Asia Minor or Egypt, indicates that the Vigil was held during the night until after midnight.[100] The term *abnoctantem* used by Tertullian in connection with this vigil seems to indicate the same thing.[101] We also have trustworthy witnesses to such an horarium in Jerome as cited above, Augustine[102] and Paulinus of Nola.[103] According to the *Apostolic Constitutions,*[104] the faithful gathered at vespers of Saturday and continued the vigil until the dawn of Sunday, whence the name for such vigils *pannuchis.*[105] In the ninth century Rabanus Maurus indicates that the Vigil began towards the vesper hour, about five o'clock in the evening.[106] And in the tenth century Pontifical of Poitiers we are told that the Vigil should begin at such a time in order that the people be not dismissed before midnight, the reason being the apostolic tradition that the Lord would come during this Vigil.[107] This is probably what is behind the insistence of Rupert of Deutz that the *Alleluia* should not be sung before midnight and therefore the ceremony should be protracted by some means, a sermon for instance, in order to observe this prescription.[108] *Circa initium noctis* is still the time indicated for beginning the Vigil in the twelfth century *Decretum Gratiani,*[109] but thereafter the tendency of placing the Vigil earlier and earlier in the day shows itself. Mabillon's *Ordo Romanus X* of the twelfth century has the function begin at noon,[110] while the twelfth century Roman Pontifical allows the ceremony to begin at eleven o'clock in the morning.[111] From this point it was but a small step to early morning hours, which finally became obligatory only in the *Missale*

100 Quasten, *Monumenta,* pp. 336-37.

101 *Ad uxorem,* II, 4. MPL, I, 1294.

102 *Sermo* 219 and 228. *MPL,* XXXVIII, 1088, 1101.

103 *Vita S. Ambrosii,* n. 48. *MPL,* XIV, 43.

104 V, 19. *MPG,* I, 891-94.

105 Anthanasius, *Apol. ad Constantinum,* 25; *Apolog. pro fuga,* 24. *MPG,* XXV, 625, 673.

106 *De cleric. instit.,* 2, 38. *MPL,* CVII, 350.

107 Cf. M. Righetti, *Manuale di Storia Liturgica.* II (Milan: Ancora, 1946), p. 167, note 220.

108 *De div. off.,* 7, 11. *MPL,* CLXX, 190.

109 III, 1, 50, *MPL,* CLXXXVII, 1722.

110 N. 16. *MPL,* LXXVIII, 1014.

111 Cf. J. A. Jungmann, "Die Vorverlegung der Ostervigil seit dem christlichen Altertum," *Liturgisches Jahrbuch,* I (1951), 53, note 31.

Romanum of Pius V in 1570. Fortunately Pius XII already in 1951 restored the Easter Vigil to its proper time.

The ceremonies of the Vigil may be divided into the following sections: (1) the blessing of new fire, (2) the blessing of the Paschal Candle with the procession and Preconium, (3) the reading service, (4) the blessing of baptismal water, conferring of Baptism and renewal of baptismal vows, (5) Mass and Lauds.

A blessing of new fire appears for the first time in the Papal Liturgy for this night in the twelfth century.[112] Though the formula seems to have originated in Germany only in the tenth century,[113] the actual practice of either enkindling a new fire or at least of bringing it out from "hiding" can be found in both Rome and Germany in the eighth century.[114] While it is conjectured[115] that the German practice was originally intended to supplant the pagan custom of enkindling fires during the spring in honor of Wotan and other pagan divinities, the Roman practice seems to have been simply a question of keeping a lamp burning apart from the church, which was supposed to be kept dark on Good Friday, and using it on Saturday for the normal illumination needed for reading.[116] Amalar, however, considers this whole procedure symbolic of the resurrection of Christ.[117] And indeed this certainly seems to have been behind the insistence in the twelfth century Ordos that the fire be enkindled anew on Holy Saturday before the Vigil.[118] In fact, this new fire was so precious in the eyes of the faithful, that after the blessing of the Candle they lighted their own candles from it and brought it home.[119]

The use of a special Paschal Candle was originally foreign to the Roman Rite. However, that one was used in the north of Italy in the fourth century is attested to in a letter of Jerome of 384

[112] *Ordo Rom.* X, n. 16. *MPL,* LXXVIII, 1014.

[113] Lechner-Eisenhofer, *Liturgik des Römischen Ritus* (Freiburg: Herder, 6th edit., 1953), p. 156.

[114] Pope Zachary, *Epist.* 13 *ad Bonifacium. MPL,* LXXXIX, 951.

[115] Cf. A. Franz, *Die kirchlichen Benediktionen im Mittelalter* (Freiburg, 1909), I, 517. Righetti, *op. cit.,* II, 170.

[116] Cf. above-cited letter of Pope Zachary, note 114, and *OR* XXIII, n. 24. Andrieu, III, 272.

[117] *De Ordine antiphonarii,* c. 44. *MPL,* CV, 1293.

[118] As in note 112.

[119] *Ordo Rom.* XXVIII, n. 63. Andrieu, III, 404.

in which he teases the deacon Presidius for presuming to vaunt his pride by blessing it in the presence of the bishop and his priests. [120] An indication that such a custom existed in Africa is seen in the fact that Augustine quotes a few lines from such a blessing.[121] The Fourth Council of Toledo in 633 energetically recommended its adoption to other churches.[122] But the Papal Ordos are silent on the matter, even though the titular churches and those in the suburbicarian dioceses followed the almost universal custom.[123] The practice must have been introduced into the Papal service before the 12th century, for by that time it appears in official documents.[124]

The most probable origin of the Paschal Candle is the ancient daily practice of lighting and blessing a lamp towards the evening hours to dispel the darkness of the night. Indeed this was a simple and necessary daily occurrence, but one which was elaborated and given a special ritual with psalms, chants, and orations. This ceremony was called the *Lucernarium,*[125] or service of light, and came to form a part of vespers. The fact that the Easter Vigil originally began at the vesper hour supports the claim that in the Paschal Candle and its blessing we have the survival of this primitive daily custom. This further explains how it came to pass that it is the deacon who sings the *Preconium Paschale,*[126] for the blessing of the evening light in the church was a duty especially entrusted to him.

Our Paschal Candle today is decorated with five grains of incense. This rite takes its origin from a mistranslation of the formula intended as a blessing of the Candle itself. In the Gelasian Sacramentary[127] it reads as follows: *Veniat ergo, omnipotens Deus, super hunc incensum larga tuae benedictionis infusio* . . . The word

120 *Epist.* 28 *ad Presidium,* 1. *MPL,* XXX, 188.

121 *De civitate Dei,* 15, 22. *MPL,* XLI, 467.

122 C. 9. Hefele-Leclercq, *op. cit.,* III, 269.

123 Cf. *Liber Pontificalis* (ed. L. Duchesne, Paris, 1955), I, 225; *OR* XXIII, n. 24, and *OR* XXVI, nn. 6, 9, 10, 14. Andrieu, III, 272, 326-29.

124 *OR* X, n. 17. *MPL,* LXXXVIII, 1014.

125 Hippolytus, *Apostolic Tradition* (ed. B. Botte), n. 26, pp. 60-61; *Apostolic Constitutions,* VIII, 36. *MPG,* I, 1138; Etheria, *Journal de Voyage,* n. 24, pp. 190-92. Anton Baumstark has shown that this is another carry-over from the Jewish Sabbath service: *Liturgie Comparée,* 148-49, 160-63.

126 Gregory the Great, however, does report that in Ravenna it was the bishop who did so: *Epist.,* lib. XI, 33. *MPL,* LXXVII, 1146.

127 Ed. H. A. Wilson, p. 81.

incensum as modified by *hunc* is masculine and obviously means something lighted. In service books from the tenth century on,[128] however, the pronoun *hunc* is replaced by *hoc,* thus making *incensum* neuter, meaning incense. While in the Holy Week Ordo of Pius XII the grains of incense are retained—they are symbolic of the five wounds of Christ, trophies of His victory over sin and death—the oration is returned to its original meaning, the word *cereum* being added to obviate any misunderstanding, and is used for the blessing of the Candle.

To some the various inscriptions to be made upon the Candle: the cross, Alpha and Omega as well as the current year, may seem novel. However, a cross, the Alpha and Omega are found already in the seventh century Mozarabic liturgical books.[129] And the Venerable Bede attests to the inscribing of the year on it in the eighth century.[130] For a while all these items figured in the Roman Rite at least from the twelfth century on.[131]

As the deacon goes up the aisle of the church with the lighted Paschal Candle, he stops three times and sings, *"Lumen Christi!"* And all the faithful reply, *"Deo gratias!"* The forerunner of this greeting of light is to be found also in the fourth century *Lucernarium* rite.[132] But the exclamation was quite frequently used apart from liturgical services. For instance, in an eighth century document,[133] which describes the conduct of a group of Frankish monks in their refectory, we are told that whenever it became necessary to add more light because of the fall of night, the monk who lighted the lamp cried out, *"Lumen Christi!" "Deo gratias!"* was the quick reply of the others. It took quite a while for this greeting to become part of the Roman Liturgy for this night; we find no trace of it until the thirteenth century.[134]

During the course of the Middle Ages many versions of the Paschal Preconium were composed. This appears quite natural if

[128] B. Capelle, "Le rite des cinq grains d'encens," *Questions Liturgiques et Paroissiales,* XVII (1932), 8.

[129] M. Férotin, *Le Liber Ordinum,* p. 209. Righetti, *op. cit.,* II, 176.

[130] *De ratione temporum,* c. 47. *MPL,* XC, 494-95.

[131] Andrieu, *Le Pontifical Romain,* I, 241. Righetti, *op. cit.,* II, 177.

[132] Cf. F-J. Dölger, "Lumen Christi," *Antike und Christentum,* V (1936) 1-43.

[133] *Ordo Rom.* XIX, n. 22. Andrieu, III, 220.

[134] *Ordo Rom.* XII, n. 30. *MPL,* LXXVIII, 1075.

we recall that up till the sixth century the officiants at liturgical ceremonies were left the liberty of employing their own talents in fashioning the liturgical texts themselves. Thus Ennodius (d. 521) offers us examples of two such *Preconia,*[135] and Jerome, as we have seen,[136] had been requested to compose one for the deacon Presidius of Piacenza. The text of our present *Laus cerei* is contained already in the Old Gallican Missal and the Gothic-Gallican Missal of the late seventh century.[137] The author of our *Exultet* was in all probability St. Ambrose.[138]

With the reading of the prophecies begins the traditional Roman Easter Vigil properly so-called.[139] The original number of lessons was undoubtedly twelve. Nor was this anything special for the Easter Vigil, for every vigil between Saturday and Sunday had the same number, and even after a vigiliary Mass was discontinued on these nights, the twelve lessons continued on in the Masses for Ember Saturdays.[140] All the while the tradition of twelve lessons remained intact in many regions, others oscillated from anywhere between four[141] to six[142] to ten.[143] Some localities even had as many as twenty-four, but this was due to the custom of reading each lesson in Greek as well as in Latin.[144] Yet, despite all this diversity, there reigned a remarkable concordance as to the choice of texts for reading.[145] The number twelve finally succeeded in predominating and wound its way back to Rome around the twelfth

[135] *Opuscula* 9 and 10. *MPL,* LXIII, 258-62.

[136] As in note 120.

[137] *MPL, LXXII,* 364 f., 268 f.

[138] B. Capelle, "L'Exultet pascal, oeuvre de saint Ambroise," *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati* (Vatican City, 1946), I, 219-46.

[139] All Roman documents up until the eleventh century have the service begin in this way, thus, e.g., the Paduan Codex of the Gregorian Sacramentary, ed. K. Mohlberg, p. 25; *OR* XXIII, n. 27. Andrieu, III, 272.

[140] In fact, in the Gregorian Sacramentary, which bears the mark of Gregory's abbreviating reform and contains only four lessons for the Easter Vigil, the Ember Saturdays were still called *Sabbatum in* XII *lectiones:* ed. Mohlberg, table of contents.

[141] Appendix to *Ordo Rom.* XXVIII. Andrieu, III, 412-13.

[142] Cf. A. Wilmart, "Le lectionnaire d'Alcuin," *Ephemerides Liturgicae,* LI (1937), 156.

[143] *The Gelasian Sacramentary,* ed. H. A. Wilson, pp. 82-83.

[144] *Ordo Rom.* XXXb, n. 41. Andrieu, III, 472; cf. Joannes Beleth, *Divinorum off. explicatio,* c. 106. *MPL,* CCII, 110.

[145] Cf. A. Baumstark, *Liturgie Comparée,* p. 184.

century,[146] but now the reform of Pius XII reverts to the practice of Gregory the Great with only four lessons.

Upon the completion of these readings, which were obviously intended by reason of their choice to be a preparation for Baptism, the blessing of Baptismal water and the conferring of the Sacrament itself follow. Our present day formula for blessing the water is already found in the eighth century Gelasian Sacramentary.[147] However, the practice of having the water blessed before it is used for Baptism goes back to primitive times; both Tertullian and Cyprian insist on it.[148] In order to help the people who remained in the church while Baptism was being administered spend the time in a holy manner, the Litany of the Saints was chanted. With the new Ordo of Pius XII another ceremony is added to this ritual which greatly aids in bringing home to the faithful the full import of these rites by having them renew their baptismal vows. In this way the significance of Easter as the cause of Baptismal grace is made clear, and the annual spiritual renovation of Lent culminating in a symbolic resurrection together with Christ to a more intense life of grace is given concrete expression.

Newly baptized or at least renewed in the spirit of their Baptism, the faithful now take part in the celebration of the Easter Mass. Every text in it speaks of the joy and the newness of life and light that is ours through the resurrection of Christ. Since the ancient Vigil used to end in the early morning hours, they concluded with the singing of Lauds, themselves a figure of the resurrection. This too has been restored by Pius XII.

Here in the Easter Vigil the Church is at least once in the course of the year visibly what she always is invisibly: the Bride eagerly awaiting the return of her Bridegroom. She expresses this through her long night watch, demonstrating her yearning for the dawn of that eternal day when she will inaugurate with Her Spouse the everlasting nuptials of the Lamb.

JOHN H. MILLER, C.S.C.

Holy Cross College
Washington, D. C.

146 M. Andrieu, *Le Pontifical Romain*, I, 241. Righetti, *op. cit.*, II, 178.

147 Ed. H. A. Wilson, pp. 84-86.

148 *De baptismo*, c. 4. *MPL*, I, 1311; *Epist. Synodalis* (70), c. 1. *MPL*, III, 1077.

THE FUNCTION OF MARIOLOGY

Undoubtedly Mariology has made great strides in the past twenty years. In many countries priest-scholars have banded together with the set purpose of devoting themselves to earnest study of Mary's prerogatives. This has resulted in a number of scientific works of excellent calibre in various languages. Our own country has witnessed a great increase of Marian literature. Current periodicals carry pertinent articles on Mary (one every month in *AER* since May, 1948). Some are devoted exclusively to the same, such as *Our Lady's Digest.* America's Mariological Society publishes the annual *Marian Studies.* The Marian Library at Dayton places at our disposal the latest and best in Marian literature besides a monthly reprint of noted authors. Especially noteworthy is the number of solid theological books and monographs that are now available.

POPE PIUS IN THE LEAD

Yet the one who has taken the lead in all this is none other than Pope Pius XII himself. Stressing the nature and greatness of Mary's Spiritual Motherhood over all men, he consecrated all mankind to her Immaculate Heart in 1942. In 1943 he concluded the encyclical *Mystici Corporis* with a valuable summary of Marian truths, every word of which is fraught with solid doctrine. The definition of the Assumption in 1950 and the Marian Year centenary of the Immaculate Conception in 1954 were two significant acts of his pontificate by which he was intent on teaching the world the sublime dignity and power of the Mother of God. Besides an annual letter for the month of May (1939-42), an astonishing number of allocutions and radio messages on Mary, especially in the Marian Year (1954), he gave his flock three remarkable documents: *Munificentissimus Deus* (1950), *Fulgens corona* (1953) and *Ad caeli Reginam* (1954), the latter of which crowned the Marian Year with the truth of Mary's Queenship.

All this has had various repercussions throughout the intellectual world. Discordant voices were heard in leading Protestant periodicals deploring the widening of the chasm between Catholics and Protestants, which, it was claimed, the Papal pronouncements were bringing about. Some Catholics, too, feared that emphasis on

Marian truths had been overstressed and was an obstacle to convert-making. Others were carried away with over-enthusiasm to excesses which the Holy Father himself censured as false and intemperate (*Inter complures,* 1954). One could begin to be apprehensive at the trend things have taken and wonder if it is beneficial to all concerned. Is over-emphasis in this field possible, and if so, how shall we know the proper limits?

FUNDAMENTAL REASON FOR POPE PIUS' STAND

One of the best answers to the query is offered by the well-known spiritual writer Thomas Merton (now Dom Louis, O.C.R.) in an article entitled "The Pope of the Virgin Mary," which forms part of a Symposium presented to our Holy Father Pope Pius XII on his eightieth birthday.[1] In this article, the priest-author clarifies with telling vision why a Pope is necessarily a Pope of the Madonna. Such an intimate relation exists between Mary and the Church, that in a certain sense, in the mind of God, they are identified. The visible Head of the Church, then, must be a Pope of the Madonna.

> The Blessed Virgin is not merely someone whom the Holy Father has chosen as a "specialty." Rather, it is the Blessed Virgin who seems to have chosen him as "her Pope"—her special instrument, effecting in the Church the plans God has deigned to place in her hands. He is the Pope who "belongs to" the Madonna, who is as it were moved and directed by her privileged action in the organism of the Mystical Body, in which her supreme charity makes her the Mediatrix and Dispenser of all the graces which flow down upon us from Christ our Head. . . . If the Blessed Virgin is Queen of heaven and earth, of angels and of men, it is because Christ has given her to share in the fulness of His priestly mediation and His kingly rule. *She therefore rules the Church, and, at the same time, in a mysterious sense, is the Church of Christ which she prefigures.* How can the visible Head of the Church be anything else but the "Pope of the Madonna"? He lives surrounded by her power, enlightened by her wisdom, immersed in her maternal silence which still continues to bring forth on earth, the immense mystery of God made man.[2]

Is it surprising then, that Pope Pius XII has placed such emphasis on Mary? Christianity is life and growth in Christ. The whole work of the pontificate of Pius is summed up in two words:

[1] Vatican Press, 1956.

[2] *Ibid.,* p. 400 (italics added).

Christian renewal. But renewal in Christ must come through Mary, for it is she who engenders the Christ-life in us, she who is "the holy Mother of all the members of Christ" (*Mystici Corporis*). "With her *fiat* . . . in the supernatural order of grace, she became the Mother of all who through the Holy Spirit would be made one under the headship of her Divine Son" (*C'est avec une douce,* 1947). The life of grace can only be increased with the help of the Mother of Divine Grace. Hence "devotion to Mary is the most abundant source of the renewal of Christian life" (*Fulgens corona*).

What Pius XII wants is that all men realize the part God Himself intended Mary to play in the economy of salvation. Then consecration to their Mother and Queen is a necessity. With this in mind Dom Louis continues:

> Love depends on knowledge. True devotion is nourished only by solid dogma, by the revealed word of God. If our love for Mary is to transcend the level of sentimentality and emotional velleities, it must be based on a faith which tells us who she really is, what is her power, what are her divinely given privileges.
>
> If once it could be made clear to men how loving a Mother they possess and how powerful a Queen, they might turn to her and open their hearts to the grace which she would obtain for them in order to convert their lives and consecrate them entirely to God.[3]

It is not the intention of the Holy Father merely to share with us his vision of Mary's dignity and prerogatives, and then let us passively admire them. On the contrary, he calls for action. If Our Lady has intervened so often in the chaotic affairs of our age, it is because God has appointed her a work to do in the world. And she does not intend to do it alone. She insistently requires our co-operation. But only if we are convinced of her dignity and power and mission in our world today, will we be moved to action. And it is above all the priest who must be moved to action.

> Mary rules men by love. Those she loves most are ruled most intimately by her influence, and of those she loves there is perhaps no class closer to her Immaculate Heart than the priests and apostles of her Divine Son. The Holy Father says: "If the Virgin Mother of God is on fire with love for everyone, she assuredly extends to priests a special love for they reproduce in themselves the living image of Jesus Christ"

[3] *Ibid.,* 405.

(Menti Nostrae). Priests are, in fact, "the humble instruments of the mercy of the Immaculate Heart of Mary in wonderfully reviving the faith and charity of the Christian people" *(Ibidem)*. In other words, they hold the key position in that work for Christian revival which God has placed in the hands of the Immaculate Virgin.[4]

GUIDING LIGHT

The teaching of Pope Pius concerning the Mother of God is clear and profound. As Vicar of Christ and with the authority of Christ he has taken the lead and shown us the way: deep appreciation of Mary's role in the Divine Plan and whole-hearted consecration to that ideal. If Catholic theologians are careful to follow the lines he has traced out, concludes Dom Louis,

> . . . they will not give the impression that Mariology is merely another separate dogmatic compartment in a structure without integration. They will resist the temptation to speculate on Mary in terms so abstract that they remind one of the mathematical theorem. They will not separate the Mother of God from the vital organism of theological mysteries in the midst of which she lives and moves, and from which she derives all her glory. They will see everything that is hers in its right relation to that Divine Maternity which is the source of all her dignities and which centers her, as it were, in the very Mystery of the Incarnation. If Catholic Marian devotion is careful to model itself on the pattern which has been given to us by Pope Pius XII it will shun the superficiality and formalism which make a true Christian renewal impossible, and will concentrate on the interior consecration of our whole being to Christ through the Blessed Virgin Mary.[5]

With Christ's Vicar lighting the way, no theologian or exegete need fear overstressing Mariology, if he but observe those guiding principles on which Pius insists. Neither will the Catholic laity fall into any excess if they follow the same light. In fact, we can look forward to an unprecedented era of Catholic life, in which the great Marian truths are integrated with the whole of theology and with every phase of the Church's activity.

BERNARD J. LEFROIS, S.V.D.

Immaculate Conception Seminary
Vigan, Ilocos Sur, Philippines

[4] *Ibid.*, 411.

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 413 f.

THE POWER TO CONFIRM

The particular problem that we want to consider has interested the minds of theologians and canonists for many years. We find it discussed by writers before the time of the Council of Trent,[1] and even now since the recent decree *Spiritus sancti munera*[2] authors are anxious to look for confirmation of one theory over another. Authors continue to dispute the question which has been described by Pope Benedict XIV as one of "great difficulty and complexity."[3] Our purpose is to present the several opinions that have been held by theologians through the years and to evaluate them from a consideration of the difficulties that have been offered by opposing schools.

The distinction between the *ordinary* and *extraordinary* minister of the Sacrament of Confirmation according to those very words is taught by the Council of Trent: "Si quis dixerit sanctae confirmationis ordinarium ministrum non esse solum episcopum, sed quemvis simplicem sacerdotem, anathema sit" (Sess. VII, can. 3 de confirmatione). In the *Decretum pro Armenis* we find the same terminology. "Ordinarius minister est episcopus," and finally we have the form consecrated in canon 782 of the Code of Canon Law: "Extraordinarius minister est presbyter, cui vel jure communi vel peculiari Sedis Apostolicae indulto ea facultas concessa sit." It is interesting to know that from the discussions at the Council of Trent it was determined that the formula of the Council of Florence should still be used. Father DeSmet alludes to this historical point:

> Proposita fuerat damnanda propositio: "Confirmationis ministrum non esse solum Episcopum, sed simplicem sacerdotem; sed per decursum disputationum, tam coram Patribus quam coram theologis minoribus, provocatum est ad facta historica attestantia partes habitas a simplici sacerdote in ministerio Confirmationis, et votum fuit emissum ut articulus reduceretur ad formam Concilii Florentini, quod addiderat: *ordinarium* ministrum; quod votum in definitiva redactione fuit admissum, postquam alia praevia formula fuerat proposita: si quis dixerit quemlibet sacerdotem esse ministrum Confirmationis, anathema sit."[4]

---

[1] Cf. Cappello, *De sacramentis*, I, n. 204.
[2] *AAS*, XXXVIII, 349.
[3] *De syn. dioec.*, VII, 8, n. 7.
[4] *De confirmatione*, p. 329.

The Church attaches a striking importance to the doctrine that a simple priest is not the ordinary minister of this sacrament but that he administers it validly only in virtue of the delegation of the Holy See. A conspicuous indication of this may be pointed out in the latest edition (1925) of the *Roman Ritual* in which the priest who administers confirmation by special indult is told that he should preface the ceremony by publicly warning the faithful that only the bishop is the ordinary minister of this sacrament, and by reading aloud, in the vernacular, the decree of delegation in virtue of which he is about to administer it as extraordinary minister.

Therefore, as long as we remember to call the simple priest the extraordinary minister of this sacrament, we are on safe terrain. However, we must always recognize from the undisputed facts of the past, from the history of instances in which priests were empowered by the Holy See to confirm, from the present discipline of the Church, which, besides communicating this power to certain priests by special indult, allows it *ipso jure* to certain dignitaries enumerated in the Code of Canon Law (c. 782, § 3), and from the more conspicuous fact that the Church recognizes, subject to some exceptions, the validity of confirmation by priests of the Eastern communities, whether uniate or dissident, from all these facts, we must conclude that by indult, delegation, or dispensation of the Holy See (these terms seem in this matter to be used indiscriminately in ecclesiastical documents), a simple priest becomes able to confirm validly. Still, it must be pointed out that the chrism must be blessed by the bishop.

OPINIONS ON THE QUESTION

The facts as proposed and the law of the Church as stated above lead us to the precise point at issue. What precise power is there in the simple priest by which he is constituted extraordinary minister of the Sacrament of Confirmation? Do we adequately explain the inability of a priest to confirm validly without the commission of the Holy See by saying that it is due to a lack of the power of orders or of the power of jurisdiction? A satisfactory answer to this question will not be reached unless several other problems are considered and we are sure that the limitations set by this paper will prevent our consideration of each of them sufficiently. The question of a possible separate character in the Epis-

copacy to explain the fact of the bishop being the ordinary minister of confirmation is overlooked by several authors. Does the bishop in virtue of the Episcopacy receive a new character, or is this character merely an *intrinsic extension* of the sacerdotal character? Or is the theory correct, which views an explanation for the administration of the Sacrament of Confirmation at the hands of a simple priest by an appeal to an *extrinsic extension* of the sacerdotal character? Father Connell attempts to show that in this theory there is a more plausible explanation for the whole question of the extraordinary administration of the Sacrament of Confirmation, and also for the question of a simple priest administering the minor orders.[5] We shall consider this later. Thus it might be said that after some small study of the various implications of these associated questions and the different opinions on the nature of the extraordinary power to confirm, we agree with Benedict XIV that the problem is one "of great difficulty and complexity."

We would like to advert to just two points before entering upon this question. We are little surprised in the first place, to see that Father Cappello does not pigeon-hole certain authors into certain schools because of the shade or two which will keep them outside such a particular classification. Secondly, we are inclined to question the value of the *communis* note which some authors ascribe to a certain opinion. Where some authors will consider the Billot opinion the more common opinion and include St. Thomas in their list of supporters, other authors will say that the opinion of Suarez is by far the more acceptable to theologians. We would finally like to mention that there is a certain readiness to place an author in a school to which he does not belong. At least there is reasonable doubt in the face of the little evidence we have. A case in point is the position of Father D'Ales: Father Cappello would have him supporting the Suarez-Bellarmine school; Father McCarthy would classify him with the Billot opinion, and this on the score of the very same words of Father D'Ales![6]

It is certainly true, as Father McCarthy points out, that the Decree of 1946 was not concerned with theoretical questions but with the unfortunate problem of the children who die without confirmation, because a bishop, the ordinary minister of this sacra-

[5] Cf. *AER*, LXXII (1925), 342.
[6] Cf. *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, LXX, 347.

ment, is not on hand to administer it. Father McCarthy then proceeds to show that the power given to a priest by indult (at least from the language of the indult or the decree) is very closely analogous to a power of jurisdiction, which, of course, presupposes the requisite power of orders, namely that of the priesthood. Thus a deacon could not be delegated to confirm. Not all authors would agree that delegation is equivalent to a grant of jurisdiction and Father McCarthy would be the first to admit that a certain argument cannot be derived from this one *locus*. However, let us not proceed any farther before we have offered a suitable division of the several opinions of theologians on this intricate point. We may accept the division of Cappello, realizing that in only one or two cases does he mention any particular author. We may synopsize them as follows:

(1) The priest who confirms as extraordinary minister does so validly from the power of orders alone. The delegation of the Pontiff adds nothing.

(2) In the early centuries of the Church a simple priest administered the Sacrament of Confirmation validly by the power of orders alone. Delegation was necessary *only for liceity*. Today, because of the will of the Church, both orders and delegation are necessary for validity.

(3) The delegation of the Pontiff gives to the priest a *peculiar power of orders or a peculiar augment of the power of orders*. Thus is he constituted the extraordinary minister of this sacrament.

(4) The delegation of the Pontiff gives to the priest a *peculiar power of jurisdiction* which conjoined with the power of orders renders him an extraordinary minister of confirmation. The proponents of this theory say that here we have a situation similar to confession and matrimony.

(5) The simple priest has a power that is *absolute, perfect,* and *independent* with regard to the sacraments of baptism and the Eucharist. However, his power is *inchoative, imperfect, conditioned* and *dependent* upon the delegation of the Holy Father with regard to the administration of confirmation. Therefore it is necessary that this power become *perfect* and *absolute* from the commission of the Pope. Granted that the Holy Father has delegated the simple priest, he confirms

ex ipsa sua potestate presbyterali. In favor of this opinion Father Cappello cites Bellarmine[7] and Father D'Ales (whose following words Father McCarthy believes can equally support the Billot position which is given below). The disputed words are these: "Le ministre délégué confirme en vertu du pouvoir reçu dans son ordination, mais surélevé par délégation et adapté à une oeuvre qui normalement le dépasse."[8]

(6) The simple priest has the full and perfect power to confirm but the power is always conditioned and dependent upon the will of the legitimate superior for its exercise. The proponents of this theory argue that if a simple priest in virtue of his ordination becomes the minister of baptism even in its solemn form, why should he not also, in virtue of the very same power, become the minister of confirmation since confirmation is the perfection and consummation of baptism? Again they say that it is difficult to see how the tremendous power to forgive sins and to change bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ are given to a simple priest, and yet the power to confirm which is not so august is not conferred in the sacerdotal ordination.

This will suffice as a short outline of the different theories that have been proposed. We will ourselves add to this division because it seems to exclude the interesting theory of Lercher and Straub and to pass over the opinion on the extrinsic extension of the sacerdotal character. Let us consider briefly each one of these schools.

EVOLUTION OF OPINIONS

The *first opinion* is erroneous, as Cappello says, and we might cite the significant words from the letter of Pius X *Ex Quo:* "Cui haud minus absonum est validam habendam esse Confirmationem a quovis presbytero collatam."[9] Furthermore we know that Benedict XIV declared that the Sacrament of Confirmation administered by a simple priest of the Latin rite who had only delegation from his bishop was null. Therefore we may rule out at once

[7] *De sac. confirmationis,* cap. XII.
[8] *Baptême et confirmation,* p. 162.
[9] *AAS,* III, 119.

this explanation of the radical power to confirm on the part of the extraordinary minister.

DELEGATION REQUIRED BY WILL OF CHURCH

The *second opinion* according to Cappello does not lack probability if we consider the question of the Church's power over the sacraments. As we outlined this theory before, it proposes that in the early days of the Church a simple priest administered confirmation validly by the power of orders alone. Today because of the will of the Church, both orders and delegation are required for validity. In the past delegation was necessary only for liceity. Saint John Chrysostom seems to have held an opinion much like this:

> Non multum spatii est inter presbyteros et episcopos; nam etiam presbyteri docendi munus acceperunt et Ecclesiae praesunt; ac quae ille de episcopis dixit, etiam presbyteris competunt. *Sola namque ordinatione superiores sunt, et hinc tantum videntur presbyteris praestare.*[10]

The words of St. Jerome, frequently quoted, seem to indicate the same idea: "Presbyterum omnia facere, quae episcopus excepta ordinatione sola."[11] Lercher appears to believe that Pseudo-Dionysius can be put in the same category. However, we have not been able to obtain much satisfaction from the reference he offers.[12] We may list here also Mendive,[13] the author of the article in the *Dictionnaire,* Dolger and DeSmet. The author of the article in the *Dictionnaire* says briefly: "La question dogmatique de la validité du sacrament administré par un simple prêtre est résolue: *elle dépend uniquement de la volonté de l'Eglise et dès lors du pouvoir de juridiction.*"[14] Dolger also believes that a simple priest has the power to confirm in virtue of his ordination. The fact that his administration of confirmation is invalid now if not accompanied by the delegation of the Pontiff is explained by Dolger as due to the declaration of the Church that such administration is invalid. Where the invalidity has not been declared as in the Eastern Church, there the simple priest validly confirms. What is conferred by the Holy Father is not something positive but something negative, the removal of an impediment or an obstacle

[10] *MPG,* LXII, 553.
[11] *Epist. ad Evang.* (R. de J., 1357).
[12] *De eccl. hier.,* V, I, 5 (*MPG,* III, 505).
[13] *De confirmatione,* c. 3.
[14] *DTC,* cols. 1075, 1048.

to the exercise of the priestly power. Father Lennerz objects against this explanation on the grounds that it cannot be seen according to this theory how a simple priest does *not* have the power to confirm. Dolger would retort that anyone who here and now cannot exercise validly some power he possesses may rightly be said not to have the power to place the act.[15]

We must admit that the most convincing presentation of this second opinion is given by Father DeSmet.[16] After he outlines his theory he attempts to show how it best agrees with the tenor of various statutes and regulations from early times and how historical cases can be more easily resolved. It is precisely on this latter point that Cappello attacks the DeSmet theory ("Haec sexta opinio —Billot, etc.—devitat difficultates quae habentur contra secundam sententiam—DeSmet, etc.—*ex antiquis documentis desumptas*"). DeSmet asserts that it is commonly understood that the dogmatic formula—Episcopus est minister ordinarius; simplex sacerdos est minister extraordinarius confirmationis—signifies that *only* the bishop in virtue of his ordination validly confirms but that the simple priest has only an initial and inchoative power to confirm that is given to him in his sacerdotal ordination. Such an incomplete power, according to this common interpretation, must be actuated and completed by the delegation of the Holy Father; without the latter commission the simple priest can never validly confirm. DeSmet then says that the dogmatic formula is better understood if it is construed to mean that the simple priest has the power to confirm validly *de se et vi ordinationis suae,* but that according to apostolic usage the *valid and licit administration* of the sacrament was reserved to the bishop. Therefore in early times and in ordinary circumstances a simple priest confirmed *validly but illicitly.* However, the Church, according to DeSmet, always retained the power of restricting the exercise of sacerdotal power and thus she could require either the episcopal character for the valid administration of this sacrament or she could place one or the other condition upon the conferring of confirmation—special delegation from a bishop or the Holy Father—in order that a simple priest might be constituted its minister. The Church did not use her prerogative in the beginning but now she does and

[15] Cf. Dolger, *Das Sakrament der Firmung* (Vienna, 1906), pp. 206-22.
[16] Cf. *op. cit.,* pp. 329-31.

with regard to simple priests even *sub poena nullitatis*. DeSmet alleges that the tenor of various decrees and statutes from earliest times which refer to the reservation of this sacrament to the bishop speak in such a way that he alone is the habitual *valid and lawful administrator* of confirmation. He cites the words of Innocent I who declared "*non licet* presbyteris confirmare"; he mentions also Gelasius I, Gregory the Great, and various synods, and seems to argue that wherever a phrase such as "non licet presbyteris confirmare" occurs, it is evidence to prove his theory. DeSmet adduces another argument from the fact that in the past it was easily permitted for a simple priest to confirm in the case of necessity or with the indult of a bishop, and that this was the practice without any trace of delegation from the Holy Father. The strongest point seems to be the custom in the East where a simple priest administers confirmation immediately after baptism. DeSmet shows how the Church of Rome frequently recognized the validity of such administration and that in the Council of Florence when there were many objections raised against the Greeks and among them this thorny one of the conferring of confirmation by a simple priest, we know that such a practice was not condemned. As DeSmet puts it: "additur autem quod illa omnia 'a Latinis objecta Mytilensis (Episcopus) canonice legitimeque dissolvit,' hoc solo puncto dogmatico excepto, de dissolutione scilicet matrimonii per adulterium."[17] That the practice in the East had the tacit approbation of the Holy Father which Billot and others assert, DeSmet believes is difficult to conceive, especially when it is realized that this Oriental usage continued for a long time before it was brought to the knowledge of Rome.[18] Therefore, DeSmet concludes that a simple priest *de se et vi ordinationis* was excluded only from the *licit administration* of this sacrament. The Church has since determined that valid administration is contingent upon proper delegation from the Holy See.

We do not think that the refutation of Lercher deprives this theory of all probability. There are difficulties but the theory commands a good amount of probability and it does attempt to explain some very ticklish historical cases. In addition the opinion will become more attractive if one is willing to accept the power over the sacraments such as DeSmet suggests. Lercher criticizes

[17] Harduinus IX, col. 430.

[18] Cf. De Smet, *op. cit.*, p. 330.

the theory on the ground that just as the Church cannot render null the act of consecrating bread and wine in the Sacrament of the Eucharist if on the part of the priest correct matter and form are employed and likewise the proper intention is present, so the Church cannot render null the administration of the Sacrament of Confirmation if the simple priest has received that power to confirm *vi Ordinis proprii a Domino dati.* Father DeSmet would naturally deny that there is any parity here and would explain the two cases in the light of his understanding of the Church's power over the administration of the sacraments. Father Puig De La Bellacasa also argues against this opinion on practically the same grounds.[19]

DELEGATION CONFERS POWER OF ORDERS

The *third opinion* which asserts that the delegation of the Holy Father confers a peculiar power of orders is rejected by Cappello on the grounds that the power of orders is conferred only by sacred ordination. Cappello would reduce any power of orders *juris ecclesiastici* to a power of jurisdiction but he seems to imply that most proponents of this theory are speaking of a power of orders that is *juris divini.* Such a power can never be conferred by the mere delegation or commission of the Pontiff. Against this opinion we may also cite the words of Pope Benedict XIV: "Delegare simplici presbytero potestatem exercendi ejusdem actum (i.e., confirmandi) potius ad jurisdictionem, quam ad ordinem pertinet."[20] Finally, Lercher offers his own objections which are associated in some way with his own theory that will be explained later. He argues that no one can obtain a delegated power from someone who completely lacks that power. He illustrates that principle by the example of a simple priest who may validly confirm from the delegation of an ecclesiastical superior who himself has not the power to confirm. He offers the case of a deacon who has been chosen as Pontiff. Before this deacon is ordained a priest, certainly he cannot administer confirmation himself but he can designate a simple priest to confirm validly. On the other hand a bishop, who in virtue of his power of orders confirms validly, cannot communicate the power of confirming validly if there is no delegation from the Holy Father.[21]

[19] Cf. *De sacramentis,* p. 190.
[20] *De syn. dioec.,* VII, 8.
[21] Cf. Lercher-Umberg (1948), p. 203.

DELEGATION CONFERS JURISDICTION

The *fourth opinion* which holds that the delegation of the Pontiff gives to the priest a peculiar power of jurisdiction which together with the power of orders renders him an extraordinary minister of confirmation is rejected by both Cappello and Lercher. Cappello argues that this theory cannot allege in its favor an analogy with the administration of the Sacrament of Penance or Matrimony. Lercher refutes this fourth opinion on the grounds that a priest does not confirm because of any delegated jurisdiction for the very simple reason that the administration of the Sacrament of Confirmation is *not* an act of jurisdiction. We believe that most authors now hold that the delegation of the Pontiff confers a power of jurisdiction and nothing else. In fact, this is the very conclusion Father McCarthy comes to when he examines the words of the recent Decree *Spiritus sancti munera.* This leads us to the opinion held by Suarez and many other authors who certainly will not agree that the complement of which they speak, which is required for the inchoative power of the priest to be exercised, is of necessity a power of jurisdiction.

OPINION OF SUAREZ

The *fifth opinion,* then, is that of Suarez. It maintains that a simple priest has a power that is *absolute, perfect, and independent* with regard to the administration of the Sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Eucharist. However, this power is *inchoative, imperfect, conditioned and dependent* upon the delegation of the Holy Father with regard to the administration of confirmation. In his thirty-sixth disputation on the sacraments Suarez explains how we should understand the power of a simple priest to confirm. That power is a *potentia remota vi suae ordinationis* belonging to the priest but it requires for its valid exercise the commission or delegation of the Pontiff. The sacerdotal character of itself does not suffice but it must be perfected and completed by the indult of the Pontiff. Suarez argues that since the character is not a physical potency, but a seal or an indelible mark that brings with it the qualities of a moral power or capacity, it can readily be understood how such a moral power might depend upon the delegation of a higher superior for its valid exercise.[22] Bellarmine uses prac-

[22] Cf. *De sacramentis,* tome I, disp. 36, sect. 2.

tically the same terminology when he says that the bishop has the *absolute, perfect* and *independent* power to administer confirmation but that the simple priest has that power only *inchoatively* and *imperfectly*. The priest has the sacerdotal character which is an *absolute, perfect* and *independent* power with regard to the Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist but his power to confirm is *inchoative, imperfect* and *dependent* upon the will of a superior for its valid exercise. Therefore, unless this inchoative power is perfected by the delegation of the superior, the simple priest does nothing at all if he goes through the rite of administering confirmation. However, if that inchoative power is perfected, then he confirms *ex ipso suo charactere*.[23]

Thus we can easily see that the opinions of Suarez and Bellarmine are much the same. Just how popular is this opinion? We have examined every dogmatic theological manual and moral theology textbook that was available, and we have learned that the following hold in its principal outlines the Suarezian theory: Pesch, Otten, Sasse, Puig De La Bellacasa, Billuart, Cappello (according to Father McCarthy, but in the latest revision Cappello *"omnibus mature perpensis"* adopts the Billot opinion), Van Noort, Marc-Gestermann, Bozzola, Daffara, D'Ales, Lennerz, Merkelbach, Noldin-Schmitt, Vermeersch, Duane, Lehmkuhl, Genicot-Salsmans, Coronata, Piolanti and finally the Wirceburgenses.

This is an impressive list of proponents for any theory. It is true that in essentials all these authors would agree that the power of the simple priest to confirm is incomplete and imperfect if we consider his sacerdotal character. Pesch compares the episcopal and sacerdotal characters and concludes that the episcopal character is the total cause by which God *ex parte ministri* is moved to posit the effect of the sacrament; in the case of the simple priest the sacerdotal character together with the deputation is the total cause in such a way that these two partial causes are not *coordinate* but *subordinate* because the deputation presumes that the sacerdotal character is present and the character is the radical and principal element.[24] This explanation at once presents us with a difficulty that is at the bottom of all the criticism of the Suarez

[23] Cf. *De sac. confirmationis*, cap. XII.
[24] Cf. *De sacramentis*, n. 555.

opinion. It is the patent one of trying to conceive the power of administering confirmation as the operation of these two causes. We must remember that when we raise the question as to just what is conferred by the delegation of the Pope, we are told by the proponents of this theory that it is the complement to the incomplete and inchoative power of the simple priest, but that this complement is a certain *dignitas* which is neither a power of orders nor of jurisdiction. This is a strange power that is given by the delegation of the Pope, a power, or better, a *dignitas* (this is the term most authors use), which is neither *potestas ordinis* nor *potestas jurisdictionis*. Lehmkuhl makes this very clear when he says:

> Ergo id quod presbyter recipit, ut possit confirmare, non est potestas jurisdictionis, sed est *dignitas,* quae ad eandem speciem refertur ac potestas ordinis, *attamen potestas ordinis non recte vocatur,* quia non intrinsecus per ordinationem, sed extrinsecus per delegationem confertur. Id vero, quo fit, ut Summus Pontifex presbyterum ita elevare et aptum ministrum Confirmationis facere possit, utique potestas jurisdictionis est, qua supremam facultatem regendae Ecclesiae habet.[25]

We must admit that such a *dignitas* which is reducible to a species of orders, but conferred extrinsically by the exercise of a power of jurisdiction, is very much of an indeterminate concept for us. Father McCarthy also admits his inability to understand just what is meant by making perfect, absolute and independent an inchoate priestly power. In addition to this difficulty McCarthy maintains that after the priest's power is perfected and made absolute and independent by the apostolic concession, it would seem to follow that the priest might validly confirm everywhere. We know that this conclusion may not be accepted. Therefore, McCarthy holds that this process of perfecting can imply little more than the grant of a limited jurisdiction.[26] Frequently the words of Benedict XIV[27] are quoted against the opinion of Suarez. We have seen those words already but it would be well to repeat them here: "Delegare simplici presbytero potestatem exercendi ejusdem actum (i.e.. confirmandi) potius ad jurisdictionem, quam ad ordinem pertinet." McCarthy uses this quotation to show that jurisdiction is conferred by the Pope but it would not be especially telling against the Suarez

[25] Lehmkuhl, II, 71.

[26] Cf. *Irish Eccl. Rec.,* LXX, 349.

[27] *De syn. dioec.,* VII, 8.

position because the distinction would immediately be drawn between the exercise of jurisdiction on the part of the Holy Father and the precise *dignitas* which is not jurisdiction that is received by the simple priest. The proponents of the Suarez theory could use the parity from the law of fasting and abstinence; the dispensatory power of the priest is certainly the exercise of jurisdiction, but who would say that jurisdiction is communicated by such an exercise?

The principal difficulty, therefore, against the Suarez opinion is to conceive just what this *complement,* this *dignitas* is, which *completes, makes perfect* and *independent* the *inchoative, imperfect* and *dependent* power of the simple priest. We receive little clarification from the different authors. Otten says that by the deputation of the Pope the power of orders is *extriniscally amplified* and elevated and thus the simple priest becomes a valid minister of confirmation. Sasse speaks of the necessity of a simple priest to have *"an internal ontological charisma and an external delegation."* Because of his character the bishop has a *dignitas* which is internal, perpetual, and indelible but the simple priest must receive a *dignitas* which perfects the internal *dignitas* which of itself is not sufficient to render him a minister of confirmation. This *internal dignitas* is extrinsically completed and elevated by the delegation of the Holy Father.[28] Puig De La Bellacasa refers to the remote potency in the character of the priest for the administration of confirmation; it can only become a proximate potency by the delegation of the Pontiff. He denies that the Church has the power over the sacraments such as the opinion of DeSmet would postulate, and contends that the latter theory appears to be incongruous with several citations from Trent, especially canon 7: "Si quis dixerit, *episcopos non esse presbyteris superiores;* vel non habere potestatem confirmandi et ordinandi, vel eam, quam habent, *illis esse cum presbyteris communem . . . anathema sit."*[29] We have already seen that Cappello in an earlier edition of his work preferred this Suarez-Bellarmine opinion. McCarthy as late as 1949 in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* remarked that Cappello "opts for the theory expounded by Bellarmine." However, in the latest revision of his *De confirmatione,* we learn that Cappello has altered his opinion

[28] Cf. *De sacramentis,* p. 288.

[29] *Denz.,* 967.

in favor of the Billot theory. Cappello says: "The sixth opinion, which partly agrees and partly disagrees with the second and the fifth, must be said to be *more probable* after consideration of all the aspects of the problem—*omnibus mature perpensis.*" The reason that he offers for his change of mind is that this opinion, unlike the opinion of DeSmet, avoids the difficulties that are raised from the early documents of the Church.

Van Noort explains the Suarez theory by appealing to an extrinsic augmentation to the dignity of the simple priest produced by the delegation of the Holy Father. He agrees that this augment is neither a power of orders nor a power of jurisdiction.[30] Bozzola refers to the opinion of Suarez as the *most probable,* but from his own words we may find a departure from the common way of referring to the complement of the inchoative power of the priest. Bozzola asserts that the power in the priest is a radical power to confirm but delegation is necessary. What is given to the priest by the delegation of the Holy Father? Bozzola appears to say that jurisdiction is conferred by the act of the Pope. His own words are these: "Ideo habent quidem ratione sacerdotii potestatem aliquam *radicalem confirmandi,* quae tamen, ut ad actum reducatur, debet compleri aliqua delegatione a suprema auctoritate quae *suppleat defectum debitae jurisdictionis.*"[31] Now it should be noted here that Bozzola would not agree with Sasse who says that the jurisdiction which the Pope exercises is not what the simple priest receives. Sasse's own words are: "Unde licet Romanus Pontifex . . . exerceat potestatem jurisdictionis, *non tamen id quod sacerdos accipit, ut valide confirmare possit, est potestas jurisdictionis.*"[32] We consider this an important point of division among authors, even among those orthodox followers of the opinion of Suarez who hold an inchoative power in the priest to confer confirmation. Daffara also insists upon the same point as Sasse, i.e., although the Holy Father exercises an act of jurisdiction, it is not jurisdiction which the priest receives in order to be constituted the extraordinary minister of the sacrament. Daffara explains what the priest does receive as an extrinsic deputation; it is not something intrinsic, it does not pertain to the power of jurisdiction nor is jurisdiction demanded by this sacra-

[30] Cf. *De sacramentis,* I, 216.

[31] *De sacramentis,* p. 111.

[32] Sasse, p. 288.

ment in the same way as in the case of penance which is a judicial act; by the delegation of the Pontiff the priestly power of orders is extrinsically amplified and elevated with the result that in "dignity and efficacy it is equal to the dignity of the bishop."[33] The opinion of D'Ales, according to Cappello, resembles that of Suarez; according to McCarthy, arguing from the same words, D'Ales can be shown to favor the Billot theory. Lennerz appears to favor the Suarez opinion and shows how, in accordance with this theory, it may be said that a simple priest in virtue of his ordination has no power to confirm, and yet, on the other hand, how the power to confirm may be communicated to no one but a priest. Merkelbach, Noldin-Schmitt, Vermeersch and Duane all explain the Suarez opinion in the traditional way; Lehmkuhl develops the Suarez opinion out of a consideration of the *ratio theologica* argument for the administration of this sacrament by a simple priest. Genicot-Salsmans and Coronata refer to the incomplete power that must be complemented. Piolanti speaks of this complement as negative rather than positive in a way similar to the explanation of Dolger. However, as far as we can determine, Dolger does not refer to an inchoative power of the priest.

We have seen sufficiently the broad outlines of the Suarez opinion and the shades of difference within the theory. We have seen the general criticism made against it. We might refer finally to the refutation of Lercher who also admits his difficulty in conceiving a power to confirm as composed partly of an internal consecration and an external deputation. Lercher holds that we should rather look upon the power to confirm as an indivisible moral power which is either completely present or completely absent. Just as the baptismal character, which is a necessary prerequisite for receiving the diaconate, is not an *inchoatio diaconatus* but a *dispositio praevia* by which a man becomes an apt subject for the diaconate, so the priestly consecration is not an inchoative power to confirm, but a *dispositio praevia* by which a priest becomes capable of receiving the power of confirming either by consecration or by the designation of the Holy Father. We shall consider this theory of Lercher and Straub after a brief discussion of the sixth opinion in our division which is that of Cardinal Billot.

[33] *De sacramentis*, p. 242.

OPINION OF BILLOT

This *sixth opinion* is considered by Cappello to be the more probable theory—more probable than the Suarez opinion which he has discarded. On examination it will be seen partly to agree and partly to disagree with the second opinion (that of DeSmet) and the fifth opinion (that of Suarez and Bellarmine). This theory contends that the simple priest has the full and perfect power to confirm but the power is always conditioned and dependent upon the will of the legitimate superior for its valid exercise. In support of this theory we have found the following authors: Billot,[34] Lepicier,[35] D'Ales, Diekamp, McCarthy,[36] Canon Smith,[37] Canon George,[38] Cappello.[39] From the number of proponents whom we could find for this Billot opinion, we are inclined to reserve judgment that this sixth explanation is the more common one as Hervé maintains.

Billot argues for this opinion on the grounds that since the delegation of the Holy Father is necessary for the valid administration of this sacrament by the extraordinary minister, the priestly character is not an absolute power to confirm but a conditional one. It might be well in this connection, since Canon George speaks of the character of the priest in the same way as Billot, to point out a fundamental difference between these two authors and the position of Lercher. The latter maintains that the power of orders is the moral power of positing an act that produces grace *ex opere operato;* therefore it does not consist partly in an internal physical character, nor does its essence postulate that it be associated with some definite character. Here are Lercher's own words: "Potestas Ordinis *ex toto* est facultas moralis nomine Christi ponendi ritum ex opere operato sanctificantem; *idcirco non consistit ex parte in charactere physico interno, neque ejus essentia postulat, ut conjuncta sit cum certo aliquo charactere.*"[40] Therefore Billot places the full power, although conditioned, in the

[34] Cf. *De ecclesiae sacramentis,* pp. 308-309.
[35] Cf. *De baptismo et confirmatione,* p. 410.
[36] Cf. *Irish Ecclesiastical Record,* LXX, 349.
[37] Cf. *The Sacrament of Confirmation,* II, 833.
[38] Cf. *Summer School of Catholic Studies,* 1929.
[39] Cf. *De sacramentis,* I, n. 204.
[40] Lercher-Umberg, IV, 273.

presence of the sacerdotal character; Lercher places the power to confirm in the communication of that moral power by God because of an exigency placed by the act of delegation of the Holy Father. Among the defenders of the Billot opinion Diekamp refers to the power of the priest to confirm as ligated and conditioned upon the indult of the Pope. McCarthy explains that the priest who confers confirmation acts in virtue of a twofold power, a power of orders and a power of jurisdiction. "When the Holy See empowers a priest to confirm, it removes, within prescribed limits, that restriction (the restriction placed upon the simple priests to confirm validly). The limited removal of the restriction can most satisfactorily be understood as a grant of jurisdiction in relation to certain defined classes of confirmands."[41] McCarthy examines a few passages from the Decree of 1946 *Spiritus sancti munera* and comes to the conclusion that the language used in these passages suggests that the power to confirm, given to the priest by indult, is, at the least, very closely analogous to a power of jurisdiction which, however, presupposes the requisite power of orders, namely, that of the priesthood. Thus a deacon could not be delegated to confirm.

OTHER OPINIONS

We would like to allude to two other opinions which are not too simple to classify. In the first place, there is the theory of Lercher and Straub which we have seen in its broadest outlines. They contend that the delegation from the Pontiff confers a *right* which is *exigitive* of the necessary power to confirm. The sacerdotal character is only a *dispositio praevia,* the very power itself to confirm comes directly from God. The example cited by both Lercher and Straub of the inability of a Pope who is a mere deacon communicating the power to confirm is rejected by Puig De La Bellacasa who appeals to the *dignitas* of the Suarez-Bellarmine theory which is neither a power of orders nor of jurisdiction and which can easily be communicated by such a Pope. We sincerely believe that this is no answer against the Lercher-Straub opinion at all. Regardless of what this perfecting power of Suarez is called, whether it is called a *dignitas* or anything else, it is difficult to see how an inchoate power of orders is perfected by anything

[41] Cf. *loc. cit.*

else than a complement of orders, and this simply cannot be communicated by a Pontiff who is merely a deacon. Perhaps Lercher and Straub[42] are wrong in proposing that the priesthood is only a *dispositio praevia,* but we must admit that it is much more plausible than the concept of an imperfect power of orders that is rendered perfect and complete by the exercise of an act of jurisdiction which confers a *dignitas,* that is neither a power of orders nor a power of jurisdiction.

We would like to mention finally the opinion of Father Connell who believes that the power of a simple priest to confirm is better and more satisfactorily explained by an appeal to the Vasquez theory that the episcopal character is a mere extrinsic extension of the sacerdotal character. The best application of the Vasquez theory is precisely here, according to Connell, where one faces the difficulty of explaining the deputation of a simple priest to confirm.[43] Connell asks the question: "If the episcopal power essentially consists in a new sacramental order or an intrinsic extension of the priestly, how can such power, even in a limited degree, be acquired by a deputation, which certainly produces no intrinsic alteration of the character?" He questions the reality of a *dignitas* which is neither a power of orders nor a power of jurisdiction when he considers the general principle that all power in the Church is reducible to one of these two species.

We believe that this explanation has much in its favor, but just as the DeSmet opinion is constructed on a postulate that must first be accepted (the power of the church over the sacraments such as DeSmet demands), so this opinion of Connell is founded on the postulate that the episcopacy is not a distinct character but an external extension of the sacerdotal character.

CONCLUSION

An examination of many authors leads to the opinion that the *communis* note belongs rather to the Suarezian-Bellarmine opinion, as Noldin and Bellacasa assert, than to the Billot opinion, as Hervé declares.

It is impossible in a paper of this length to consider all the ramifications of these different opinions. What is the real signifi-

[42] Cf. Straub, *De ecclesia Christi,* II, 55, n. 688.
[43] Cf. *De sacramentis,* I, 162, n. 150; also *AER,* LXXII, 342.

cance behind the different words that the authors use—*indultum, commissio, concessio, deputatio, dispensatio, permissio, delegatio, designatio?* It remains an open question in the light of all these opinions to speculate on the foundation of power in the priest, and the nature of the communication of the Holy Father. It is simple to say that the *commissio* on the part of the Pope is an exercise of jurisdiction, but what proceeds from this act of jurisdiction and is received by the priest is the *real* question to be answered. Sasse, as we saw, insisted on this distinction when considering the *commissio.*

We have seen that the DeSmet opinion depends considerably upon an acceptance of the theory that the Church has a power over the substance of the Sacrament of Confirmation. Likewise we have understood that the opinion of Connell depends upon the Vasquez conception of the episcopacy as a mere external extension of the sacerdotal character. We cannot conceive of the *dignitas* of Suarez in any other way than as a participating in the nature either of orders or of jurisdiction. Between the opinion of Lercher-Straub who would make of the priesthood a mere *dispositio praevia,* and that of Billot who would give all power to confirm to the simple priest but only demand that it be understood as conditional and dependent, our hearts are with the Cardinal but our heads are with the Innsbruck professors.

THOMAS A. WASSMER, S.J.

Le Moyne College
Syracuse, N. Y.

CATHOLICS IN COLONIAL AMERICA

PART IV

In the issues that divided England and America on the eve of the Revolution the Catholics had little to gain from sympathy with the mother country. It is true that in June, 1774, the British Government made a generous grant of religious freedom to the Catholics of Canada; but it was equally true that this same government had as recently as August, 1767, sentenced a priest in England to imprisonment for life for unlawfully exercising the functions of his ministry and paid his informer a reward of 100 pounds for reporting him. Nor was it any more generous four years later to the Catholics of Ireland when the only concession which they could wring from the penal laws was the permission to take leases on fifty acres of bog. These things were known to the American Catholics and most of them, therefore, had no illusions about what England might do for them. On the other hand, the colonial governments had treated them no better, but the prospect of change gave ground for hope that a new order might open the way to freedom and equal rights. Economically speaking, the Catholics among the plantation owners of Maryland, the shopkeepers of Philadelphia, and the farmers of Pennsylvania felt every bit as much the indignity of the stamp tax and the import duties of Viscount Townshend as their non-Catholic neighbors.

In the political order the penal laws that still denied to Catholics the right to vote, to hold office or to participate in public life—and the spirit which their prolonged enforcement had induced—naturally left them far more reticent than others. But where political privilege was withheld a combination of wealth, social prestige, and an uncommon gift for debate furnished the Catholics with a voice. In Maryland the arbitrary actions of the royal governor, Robert Eden, had aroused deep resentment. Eden's attempt to rule by proclamation angered no Marylander more than the leading Catholic, Charles Carroll of Carrollton, who in February, 1773, began a series of remarkable letters in the *Maryland Gazette* over the signature of "First Citizen." They were directed at Daniel Dulany, the protagonist for the colonial government, who had been writing under the name of "Antillon." As the controversy pro-

ceeded it became evident that Carroll had much the better of the argument, and that his vigorous defense of the principles of free and representative government had won the sympathy of their audience. In an effort to discredit him Dulany then resorted to an attack on Carroll's right to speak because he was a Catholic. It was the Catholic and the patriot who at that point replied on May 6:

> What my speculative notions of religion may be, this is neither the place nor time to declare; my political principles ought only to be questioned on the present occasion; surely they are constitutional, and have met, I hope, with the approbation of my countrymen; if so Antillon's aspersions will give me no uneasiness. He asks, who is this Citizen? A man, Antillon, of an independent fortune, one deeply interested in the prosperity of his country; a friend to liberty, a settled enemy to lawless prerogative.[65]

In the end Carroll's effective polemics not only vanquished Dulany but they played a leading part in swinging the Maryland election of May, 1773, in favor of the patriot party that had opposed the governor. Moreover, the forthright manner in which he had met the attack on his religion gave heart to many of his co-religionists who for the first time had witnessed a Catholic defend his faith and win the respect of many non-Catholics for doing so. Even so prejudiced a spectator as Jonathan Boucher, one of the leading Anglican ministers of Maryland, and himself a loyalist, credited Carroll with settling the doubts of the Catholics who, he said, soon "became good Whigs, and concurred with their fellow-revolutionists in declaiming against the misgovernment of Great Britain."[66]

Yet before the American Catholics were finally permitted to emerge from the catacombs in which the penal codes had managed to bury them, they were destined to suffer further ignominy over the grant of religious freedom to their Canadian brethren. With the rising temper of the colonists the English government was anxious to assure the Canadians' loyalty to the crown. They succeeded admirably in their purpose by the passage of the Quebec Act in June, 1774. But this same measure extending, as it did, the

[65] Kate Mason Rowland, *The Life of Charles Carroll of Carrollton, 1737-1832, With His Correspondence and Public Papers* (New York, 1898), I, 285.

[66] Jonathan Boucher, *A View of the Causes and Consequences of the American Revolution* (London, 1797), p. 242.

boundaries of the province to the west and south, restoring French law, and, above all, guaranteeing freedom to the Catholic Church, raised a frightful storm throughout the colonies. Leaders like Alexander Hamilton grew almost hysterical, and the *Pennsylvania Packet or General Advertiser* of October 31 warned that Protestant churches might be converted into mass houses and the colonists' lands plundered for tithes in support of a popish clergy. "The Inquisition may erect her standard in Pennsylvania," they cried in alarm, "and the city of Philadelphia may yet experience the carnage of a St. Bartholomew's day."[67] Items such as this must have made sober reading for Father Robert Molyneaux, Father Farmer, and their congregations at St. Joseph's and St. Mary's in the City of Brotherly Love. And yet these outbursts were probably less painful to the Catholics of Pennsylvania than they were to those of Maryland, for the mild treatment they had received from the government of the former colony made them less enthusiastic for a break with England than their Maryland brothers.

In fact, whatever loyalist sentiment there was among American Catholics was confined to Pennsylvania. After Lord Richard Howe's army had occupied Philadelphia in September, 1777, a Catholic by the name of Alfred Clifton went over to the British and recruited 176 men to fight for them under the name of the Roman Catholic Volunteers.[68] As it turned out this battalion had a quite inglorious record and the serious breaches of discipline and military decorum among both officers and men in time led to its suppression as a separate unit. On the initiative of General Sir Henry Clinton and Lord Francis Rawdon, however, a more successful venture was launched at Philadelphia in May, 1778, when these officers were able to raise the so-called Volunteers of Ireland which numbered nearly 400 men with whom the Roman Catholic Volunteers were later merged. Clinton attributed his success to the fact that among Britain's chief antagonists in America were the Irish immigrants who were there in sufficient numbers to retain a strong national feeling which kept them from being assimilated to the Americans. Therefore, by playing on this national feeling

[67] Quoted in John C. Miller, *Origins of the American Revolution* (Boston, 1942), p. 373.

[68] Charles H. Metzger, S.J., "Some Catholic Tories in the American Revolution," *Catholic Historical Review,* XXXV (October, 1949), 280.

and by the flattery of advertising that the regiment would be composed exclusively of Irish personnel, he reported that over 380 Irishmen had deserted from the American army and joined the British.[69] The Volunteers of Ireland fought all during the war and gave an especially good account of themselves in the campaigns in South Carolina where they were disbanded after the British evacuated Charleston in December, 1782.

The majority of the Pennsylvania Catholics, however, threw in their lot with their fellow Americans. It was a Philadelphia Catholic, Stephen Moylan, who was among the first to join Washington's army at Cambridge where he was made muster-master general in August, 1775, and he continued to serve with distinction until ill health forced him to give up after Cornwallis' surrender at Yorktown. His fellow townsman, John Barry, had an even more spectacular career in the infant American navy. In April, 1776, Barry had the honor of being the commander of the first regularly commissioned American cruiser to capture a British warship in actual battle when his *Lexington* overcame the British ship *Edward.* In the case of the Catholics of both Pennsylvania and Maryland the grant of religious freedom in the bills of rights passed by those states in the closing months of 1776 heightened enthusiasm about joining the fighting forces now that they could do so as equals of the other troops. In the sequel the Catholics furnished their full share of recruits.

If in the first years the Catholic colonials had shown a reserved attitude toward the revolutionary cause, there was ample reason for it. In the hub-hub that arose over the Quebec Act in 1774 the Continental Congress clearly manifested its dislike of the Catholic Church when it adopted on September 17 of that year the so-called Suffolk Resolves. Moreover, a month later that body addressed letters to King George III and to the people of Great Britain in which the same sentiments were expressed. After outlining their various objections to the Quebec Act Congress told the British people on October 21:

Nor can we suppress our astonishment, that a British Parliament should ever consent to establish in that country a religion that has

---

[69] *Ibid.*, p. 288.

deluged your island in blood, and dispersed impiety, bigotry, murder and rebellion through every part of the world.[70]

Matters were scarcely improved by the communication which Congress sent five days later to the Canadians in an effort to win their assistance. They assured these French-speaking Catholics that their recently won religious freedom had been given to them by God, not by Great Britain. It was a boon which they would retain under the free government which the Americans were inviting them to join. Nor was there a lack of precedent for such a union, since Switzerland offered an example of a country where Protestants and Catholics lived in peace and harmony under a single government. Congress piously invoked the light of divine wisdom that their neighbors to the north might be inspired to attach themselves to the Americans and, they concluded, that God "may grant to our joint exertions an event as happy as our cause is just, is the fervent prayer of us, your sincere and affectionate friends and fellow-subjects."[71] It would be difficult to find in the records of American legislative bodies a more insincere document. Its insincerity was not lost upon the Canadian Catholic leaders who knew the true mind of Congress on the subject of their religion and who were likewise quite satisfied with the rights granted to them in the Quebec Act. In the end their counsel kept their people loyal to the British crown.

If in times of stress it is often difficult to maintain complete candor, it is then just as difficult to adhere to old prejudices and principles. General Washington—who was personally free from

[70] Worthington Chauncey Ford (Ed.), *Journals of the Continental Congress, 1774-1789* (Washington, 1904), I, 88.

[71] *Ibid.*, I, 112-113. Less than three weeks before one of the leading members of Congress, John Adams, spent part of an afternoon attending a religious service at St. Mary's Church in Philadelphia. He revealed what he thought of Catholicism when he told his wife in a letter of October 9, "This afternoon's entertainment was to me most awful and affecting; the poor wretches fingering their beads, chanting Latin, not a word of which they understood. . . ." Adams described the altar furnishings, the vestments of the priest, and the music, and then concluded, "Here is everything which can lay hold of the eye, ear, and imagination—everything which can charm and bewitch the simple and ignorant. I wonder how Luther ever broke the spell." Charles Francis Adams (Ed.), *Familiar Letters of John Adams and His Wife Abigail, During the Revolution* (New York, 1876), p. 46.

religious prejudice—made that lesson clear to his troops encamped at Cambridge in November, 1775, when he discovered that they were once more preparing to burn the pope in effigy and insult the Catholics in the annual celebration of Guy Fawkes Day. He stopped the nonsense at once, and in rebuking those who were planning the affair when the Americans still hoped to gain Canada, he remarked, "to be insulting their Religion, is so monstrous, as not to be suffered or excused . . ."[72] That very month Congress had appointed a committee and appropriated funds for the purpose of soliciting the aid of the foreign powers. It would ill become the Americans, then, to indulge their prejudices lest word of it should reach Catholic countries like France and Spain and result in serious injury to their cause. Moreover, as time gave opportunity for deeper reflection on the implications of the break with England, it became apparent to a number of leading men that the varied pattern of American religious life left little alternative but to declare all religions equal before the law. It was a thought that sprang from personal conviction with some; with others it was a policy dictated by expediency, either to win a united front for war or to be rid of an established church. In a certain sense the tables had turned, for what many had characterized as expediency in the seventeenth century when Catholic leaders like Baltimore and Dongan had granted religious toleration, could now with equal justice be said of the present policy. In any case, Virginia led the way with its act of religious toleration in June, 1776, and by the end of that year Pennsylvania and Maryland had followed suit. The Catholics of these two states could now share in the revolutionary struggle as equals.

Previous to this legislation, however, the Continental Congress had found it wise to stifle its prejudice against Catholics when it decided in February, 1776, to send a commission to Canada in another attempt to win its support. The commission consisted of Benjamin Franklin, Samuel Chase, and Charles Carroll, and Carroll was urged to seek the consent of his distant cousin, Father John Carroll, to accompany the delegation. Congress was at no pains to conceal its motive in naming the two Carrolls. They would, it was hoped, have an influence upon the Catholics of

[72] John C. Fitzpatrick (Ed.), *The Writings of George Washington* (Washington, 1931), IV, 65.

Canada which neither Franklin nor Chase could hope to exercise. In drawing up the official instructions for the commission care was taken to promise the Canadians entire freedom in the practice of their religion, as well as the peaceful possession of all their rights and properties by their priests. The future of the Catholic Church, it was said, would be left entirely in the hands of the Canadian people, and the only reservation mentioned was that all other Christians should be equally free and totally exempt from the payment of tithes or taxes for the support of any particular religion. "Inform them," they said, "that you are vested, by this Congress, with full powers to affect these purposes . . ."[73]

Neither of the Carrolls had sought the appointment. Charles was entirely willing to be of service to his country wherever it was felt that he could fill a need, but in doing so he had no intention of compromising his religious faith. Two years before one of his admirers had hinted that he might change his allegiance to another church and thus further his public career. Carroll indignantly repudiated the suggestion. "If my countrymen," he said, "judge me incapable of serving them in a public station for believing ye moon to be made of green cheese, in this respect their conduct, if not wicked, is not less absurd than my belief, and I will serve them in a private capacity notwithstanding . . ."[74] His cousin was likewise a first-rate patriot, but he had grave misgivings about the present proposal lest he should jeopardize his priestly office by mixing in politics. John Carroll was a man of extraordinary good sense and judgment and he fully understood the risk for him which the Canadian mission involved. As he confided to a private memorandum on the subject, "I have observed that when the ministers of religion, leave the duties of their profession to take a busy part in political matters, they generally fall into contempt, and sometimes even bring discredit to the cause in whose service

[73] Ford, *op. cit.*, IV, 217. The text of the instructions of March 20, 1776, is given here, pp. 215-18.

[74] Carroll to William Graves, Aug. 15, 1774, quoted in Ellen Hart Smith, *Charles Carroll of Carrollton* (Cambridge, 1942), pp. 122-23. Smith says, "He was that rarest of all human accidents, a born politician who was completely free from personal ambition; far from seeking a career, he did not even want one" (p. 121).

they are engaged."[75] It was an eminently sound view, and only the strong urging of his distinguished cousin and his deep personal patriotism overcame his reluctance.

In spite of their best efforts the American delegation accomplished nothing by its long and tedious journey to Montreal in the spring of 1776. From the outset they found themselves severely handicapped by the lack of funds from Congress to pay the debts incurred by the American armed forces that had invaded Canada in the previous summer. The continental currency had little or no value there, and in the end the attempt to conquer the country had resulted in failure and a humiliating retreat. Moreover, whatever effectiveness the Carrolls might have had with the Catholics was nullified by the latter's contentment with the Quebec Act's provisions relating to their religious affairs, and by the tactless manner in which men like General David Wooster had conducted themselves toward the Church during the invasion.[76] Bishop Briand of Quebec warned his people to have nothing to do with Americans in general, and when Father Pierre Floquet of Montreal permitted John Carroll to say Mass in his house he was disciplined by Briand. While in Montreal old Dr. Franklin had become quite enfeebled and it was decided, therefore, as the commissioners started for home in May, that Father Carroll should accompany him. After reaching New York late that month Franklin wrote his fellow commissioners still in Canada, "I find I grow daily more feeble, and think I could hardly have got so far, but for Mr. Carroll's friendly Assistance and tender Care of me."[77] The Canadian mission had failed, but it had at least afforded an opportunity for Franklin and Carroll to become acquainted, and a few years later the regard which Franklin had come to have for the young priest showed itself in the negotiations over the appointment of the first American Catholic bishop.

[75] Quoted in Peter Gilday, *The Life and Times of John Carroll, Archbishop of Baltimore, 1735-1815* (New York, 1922), I, 97.

[76] Wooster had closed the Catholic churches on Christmas eve and had told a committee that waited on him about the matter, "I regard you all as enemies and rascals." Quoted in Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 148.

[77] Franklin to the American Commissioners in Canada, May 27, 1776, Albert Henry Smyth (Ed.), *The Writings of Benjamin Franklin* (New York, 1906), VI, 449.

By the time that Charles Carroll arrived home in early June the exciting prospect of national independence was uppermost in everyone's mind. His native Maryland had scheduled a convention at Annapolis for June 21, and it was an indication of the speed with which ideas were changing that Carroll should have taken his seat three days later without adverse comment on the score of his religion. The convention ended by voting for independence and electing Carroll as one of the members of Congress from Maryland. From the beginning of the trouble with England he had favored a policy leading to independence, and after he entered Congress in mid-July, therefore, Carroll only awaited the engrossing on parchment of the Declaration of Independence to affix his signature proudly to the document.

The lone Catholic member of Congress was given a friendly welcome at Philadelphia since his recent outstanding achievements had won the admiration of even the most begrudging. The favor with which he was received was not unrelated to the fact that three months before King Louis XVI of France had ordered generous supplies of munitions to be placed at the disposal of the Americans. Carroll's intimate acquaintance with France during a long residence there, his fluency in the French language, and his Catholic faith might, indeed, prove useful as the negotiations moved forward to make France an outright ally. In the sequel he had little to do with the alliance which France finally signed with the United States on Feb. 6, 1778. Yet the alignment of this powerful Catholic nation—to be followed in June, 1779, by Spain's declaration of war on Great Britain—was bound to exercise a moderating influence on anti-Catholic prejudice.

Before long large numbers of Frenchmen began to appear in this country and French fashions, books, newspapers, etc., became exceedingly popular with Americans. In July, 1778, there arrived in Philadelphia with the French fleet Conrad Alexandre Gérard, first French Minister to the United States, who became at once a leading personage in the infant capital. The fleet had brought its full complement of chaplains and one of these priests, a Récollet by the name of Seraphin Bandol, was assigned to Gérard in the capacity of his almoner. The minister was alert to improve relations between the two countries, and with that in mind he took formal notice of the third anniversary of American independence to

issue invitations to Congress to attend a *Te Deum* in St. Mary's Church on July 2, 1779. The members turned out in large numbers, as they did for a similar service at St. Mary's on Nov. 26, 1781, to commemorate the victory at Yorktown. On both occasions Father Bandol was the preacher. The attendance of high officials of the American government at Catholic services infuriated some of the bigots to the point of open protest and gave the loyalist Protestant ministers added material for sermons on the ungodliness of the Americans. Nonetheless, the general effect in allaying bigotry was worth the price that had to be paid.

(To be continued)

JOHN TRACY ELLIS

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

Answers to Questions

A PROBLEM IN FASTING

Question: On a day of Church fast may a person who is bound to fast partake outside of mealtime of a drink made from cocoa, milk and sugar?

Answer: St. Alphonsus discussed at some length the question whether chocolate (as a drink) is permitted between meals on a fast day. He was referring to chocolate made with water. After citing authors who permitted this beverage, without any qualification, and others who believed that it breaks the fast, St. Alphonsus gave his own view, a middle course. He held that one cup of chocolate a day, outside of mealtimes, is permissible, because it is a form of medicine, helpful to digestion, and also because a widespread custom allows it (*Theologia moralis*, Lib. III, n. 1023). However, he would certainly not have permitted chocolate made with milk, since, in agreement with the common view of his times, he held that milk is not allowed on a fast day outside of mealtimes, because it is a form of food rather than a beverage (*op. cit.*, n. 1021).

But, whatever may be said about this problem as far as the interpretation of the general law of fasting is concerned, it would seem that in those dioceses of the United States in which the bishops allow the relative norm of fasting and make an explicit statement as to the beverages allowed on a fast day outside of mealtimes, the drink described by our questioner would be permitted, as often as one wishes. For the bishops permit milk as a beverage that does not break the fast, and since the amount of cocoa and sugar that are added would not ordinarily exceed the amount of solid matter used in the making of tea or of coffee (which are certainly permitted), I believe that cocoa made as the questioner describes could be taken as often as one desires on a day of fast. However, I would not give an affirmative judgment if cream instead of milk were used.

THE INTENTION IN GIVING EXTREME UNCTION

Question: Since the number of anointings required for Extreme Unction is not determined by divine law (and even one will suffice) what should be a priest's intention as to the precise moment in the course of the ceremony when he wishes the sacrament to be actually conferred?

Answer: When the priest gives Extreme Unction with a single anointing and a general form (generally on the forehead) he should intend to give the sacrament essentially through this ceremony, so that the other anointings that he is to supply later if the danger ceases (Can. 947, § 1) will contribute only to the integrity of the sacramental rite.

When the sacrament is given with all six anointings prescribed by the ritual, it would seem best to have the intention of giving the sacrament through the first five, and intending the anointing of the feet as adding only to the integrity. This seems best adapted to the mind of the Church in administering Extreme Unction. (Cf. Kilker, *Extreme Unction* [St. Louis, 1927], p. 46.) In that event, the sacrament is given validly even if the priest decides not to anoint the feet only after he reaches this part of the ceremony. A more difficult case would arise if the priest began the ceremony with the intention of giving the first five anointings, but then discovered in the course of the rite that for some reason one or more of the anointings cannot be given—for example, because he cannot get near the person's hands. In such a case the solution given by Cappello (who is considering the case of one who suddenly dies before the unctions are completed) would seem the best procedure —to give the single anointing on the forehead with the general form (*De extrema unctione,* n. 92).

I would add that the most practical method is for the priest to find out before beginning the sacramental rite just how many anointings can be given, and if any of the first five cannot be administered, let him use the single anointing on the forehead with the short form, and then supply whatever other unctions he can give as integral parts.

CIRCUMCISION FOR MEDICAL REASONS

Question: May a Catholic doctor circumcise an infant for medical reasons—because he believes this operation affords protection from certain types of disease and will promote physical cleanliness?

Answer: Since circumcision is a mutilation of the body—though slight—it can be justified only on the supposition that it is necessary or very useful toward obtaining some physical benefit (the principle of totality). Many doctors believe that there are definite physical benefits procured by circumcision, such as those mentioned by our questioner; and those who have this conviction may lawfully perform the operation. It is well to note, however, that other doctors believe that the necessity and utility of circumcision for all male children have been exaggerated. It would be well if this matter were more thoroughly investigated. In any event, doctors and hospital authorities should bear in mind that the decision whether or not a child is to be circumcised depends on the consent of the parents. It would be wrong to give the impression that circumcision is something that must be done and that the written permission of the parents (which is normally required) is a mere matter of routine. Parents should be aware that they are perfectly free to have this operation performed on their male children or not to have it.

ADJUSTMENT OF JURISDICTION BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE

Question: Is it correct to say that the authority given by the natural law to the civil government is not in any way restricted by the authority of the Church?

Answer: It is a Catholic doctrine that the Son of God granted His Church certain prerogatives and immunities that *per se* should be recognized by civil governments, even though this implies some limitation and restriction of the authority which civil rulers would possess if they were subject merely to the natural law. This is not to be understood in the sense that Our Lord determined in a definite manner all the privileges He meant His Church to pos-

sess. He gave the Church the mission of bringing all men to salvation, and thus implicitly granted to the Church those immunities from civil jurisdiction which are needed for the proper accomplishment of this task. This is what the Council of Trent implied when it stated that the immunity of the Church and of ecclesiastical persons "has been established by the authority of God and the ordinances of the canons" (Sess. 25, *De reformatione,* c. 20). For example, it is by virtue of this divinely established right that the Church decrees that clerics are immune from military service (Can. 121).

This principle is best illustrated by the Church's doctrine regarding her authority over the marriage of two baptized persons. The Church claims the proper and exclusive right of jurisdiction over such a marriage, since it is a sacrament, and admits the competence of civil authority over only the merely civil effects of such a marriage (Can. 1016). In other words, under the Christian dispensation the civil power does not possess over the marriages of the baptized the same authority which it would enjoy under the natural law over the marriages of all its subjects, and which it does possess actually over the marriages of the unbaptized—including especially the right to establish impediments (Can. 1038, § 2). In this matter, by the ordinance of Jesus Christ, the King of all mankind, the Church has been empowered to exercise authority which would belong to the civil authorities under the natural law.

Such is the order of things which *per se* should exist by the positive law of Jesus Christ. But, in those countries which do not acknowledge the divinely granted privileges of the Church ecclesiastical authorities are entirely willing to adjust the legislation of the Church to the laws of the land, as long as it involves no violation of God's law, or of the essential functions of the Church for the salvation of souls. Thus, in the United States, even when the Church has declared a certain marriage null and void (for example, because of the lack of the required form) a priest will not officiate at the future marriage of one of the parties until a civil divorce has been procured. The same practice is observed when a Catholic remarries by virtue of the Pauline Privilege. Similar recognition is given to state laws demanding that the clergyman be authorized by civil authorities to officiate at marriage, that a certain number of days intervene between the granting of the marriage license and the cere-

mony, etc. This form of adjustment the Church makes, not merely because it is unable to enforce its own legislation to its full extent, but also out of consideration for the good order and harmony that will be promoted in a land like the United States which recognizes all religions as equal. Certainly, as far as the United States is concerned, the requirements of civil law regarding marriage are (at least in most states) very easily fulfilled and impose very slight restrictions. And where exception can be taken to certain state laws —for example, those forbidding interracial marriage, the objection is based, not so much on the infringement of the Church's authority over Christian marriage, as on the restriction of the individual's right to marry, as granted by the natural law.

Hence, no one can claim that Catholics are not fully willing to accept the actual situation of the relation between Church and State jurisdiction in the United States, and to abstain from seeking to any greater extent than we already possess the immunity from civil law granted to the Church by her Divine Founder. At the same time we should be careful not to deny the principle that unique powers and prerogatives have been granted to His Church by the Son of God, rendering her in some respects independent of every civil jurisdiction.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

APPROACHING THE ALTAR

Question: We are building a new church and the entrance to the sanctuary is located in back of the main altar and not on either side of the sanctuary. Do we approach the altar from the gospel side or is it optional to approach from the epistle or gospel side of the altar?

Answer: The Sacred Congregation of Rites in its decree n. 3029 has directed that when the sacristy is located behind the altar, the priest should approach the altar from the gospel side and return to the sacristy by way of the epistle side.

NUMBER OF CANDLES PRESCRIBED

Question: Recently in a group of the clergy there was a discussion about the exact and required number of candles for Forty Hours' Devotion and exposition on First Friday. Please clear up the matter for us.

Answer: For exposition of the Blessed Sacrament during the Forty Hours' Devotion twenty candles must burn continuously. At other expositions of the Blessed Sacrament at least twelve candles should be lighted (S.R.C. No. 3480). More than this number may be lighted but at least there must be this number of lighted candles at these times of exposition. And just to refresh the memory, for ordinary Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament at least twelve candles must be lighted while for private exposition with the ciborium only six candles need be lighted.

ORATIO IMPERATA

Question: When we have a sung Mass on Sunday we are instructed to omit commemorations. What about the *oratio imperata* decreed in our diocese by the Most Reverend Ordinary ?

Answer: At a High Mass on Sunday there will be the following possible commemorations: (a) commemoration of the Sunday if a higher ranking feast is being observed; (b) commemoration of a first class feast; (c) commemoration of the *oratio imperata* if it is ordered "pro re gravi" by the Ordinary of the diocese. If the *imperata* is ordered *simpliciter* it is not commemorated at a sung Mass. On the average Sunday outside of Lent and Advent, normally there will be no commemorations except when an *oratio imperata pro re gravi* exists.

HOLY COMMUNION FROM SIDE ALTAR

Question: Of necessity a custom exists in our parish which does not receive the approval of all of the local clergy. After the

consecration of the Mass on Sunday, Holy Communion is distributed from a side altar, with the assisting priest reciting all the prescribed prayers. When the celebrant of the Mass comes to the time of distribution of Holy Communion is he required to say the prescribed prayers even though they have already been said by the priest at the side altar?

Answer: The fact that a second priest distributes Holy Communion from the side altar has nothing to do with the celebrant of the Mass and his actions. The celebrant continues his Mass as if such a ceremony were not taking place. We are happy to note that our inquirer looks with disfavor upon such a custom. He is not alone in his views and the writer feels that this custom could soon be eliminated if priests would honestly answer the question "just how much is gained and how much time is saved by this untimely ceremony?" It cannot be anything but deeply annoying to those trying to follow the celebrant of the Mass.

EXPOSITION MASSES

Question: (a) In offering a High Mass *coram Sanctissimo,* is there a rubric which directs the celebrant to kneel at the foot of the altar during the singing of "Et Incarnatus Est," as on Christmas? (b) According to the new rubrics governing commemorations in a sung Mass, when exposition follows immediately after the Mass, must the oration of the Blessed Sacrament be sung? and if so, does it have its own distinct conclusion?

Answer: a) We are not familiar with any rubric that directs the celebrant to kneel at the foot of the altar during the singing of the "Et incarnatus est." Rubricians direct that the ceremonies for the Solemn Mass of Exposition are the same as for any Solemn Mass except for a few minor exceptions and among them nothing is remarked about the ceremonies of the Credo. (b) The Congregation of Sacred Rites (June 2, 1955) issued an interpretation of certain questions and problems that arose relative to the Decree of March 23, 1955, simplifying the rubrics of the Mass and the Breviary. In this later decree, it is stated that "during the Forty Hours' devotion, however, or on the occasion of expositions which

may happen to be made during the year, the collect of the Most Blessed Sacrament is always to be said in all Masses at the altar of exposition, and only in those Masses." Father Barry (*Matters Liturgical*) comments further on this: "Apart from the Devotion of the Forty Hours the oration of the Blessed Sacrament shall be said as a votive collect, if after the Mass and without leaving the sanctuary the celebrant is to expose the Blessed Sacrament in the monstrance at the same altar and for a public cause. It shall also be said, if the Mass is celebrated where Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament in the monstrance and for a public cause is actually being held."

FEASTS OF SAINTS PETER AND PAUL

Question: As regards commemorations to be made in a sung Mass, with what are called inseparable orations, would we sing the one of St. Peter, e.g., on the Feast of Conversion of St. Paul; and if so does it have its own conclusion?

Answer: Father Bugnini (*Simplification of the Rubrics*) states that "an *inseparable* commemoration is always made immediately after that to which it is joined, as if they made a *quid unum*. For example, St. Peter and St. Paul on each other's feasts."

VOTIVE CANDLES

Question: The practice of having seven red votive lights burning on the altar after Mass on the feast of Pentecost has been adopted in some religious houses. What can be said of the practice?

Answer: Votive lights may be permitted on the altar if they are of beeswax in notable or greater proportion. Unless they are beeswax in a notable quantity they should not be placed on the altar during Mass or at any other time (S.R.C. No. 4147). The custom of which our inquirer speaks sounds rather pietistic and in itself is not forbidden but if such practices were to be continued for other feasts the end might be limitless.

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.

Book Reviews

THE PROTESTANT CHURCHES IN AMERICA. By J. A. Hardon, S.J. Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1956. Pp. v+365. $5.00.

The object of this manual is to present the history, doctrine, ritual, organizational structure and current statistics of the Protestant churches in America. The larger part of the work concentrates on the major Protestant denominations such as the Baptists, Episcopalians, Methodists (pp. 3-286). The remainder of the book deals with the smaller groups and a statistical survey of the sects in the United States. Yearly statistics of the Protestant churches can be obtained from Dr. Landis' *Yearbook of the American Churches.* The chief value of Hardon's manual seems to be in his presentation of doctrine, ritual and organizational structures of the denominations. This material is difficult to obtain in general survey form and in an objective manner of report.

Unlike Algermissen's *Christian Denominations,* Hardon's work is not apologetical. As the author himself states: "This volume is intended primarily for Catholic readers, to give them an up to date manual of information on the Protestant Churches in the United States" (p. xv). In the pluralism of American society it can be easily understood that many Catholics have a genuine interest in knowing about their Protestant neighbors. One can hardly be well informed about Protestant beliefs and practices because one has read the Augsburg Confession or the Thirty-Nine Articles. Hardon's manual should contribute a great deal toward more accurate and contemporary information about the Protestant denominations in America today.

All sectarian groups within the analogy of American Protestantism are not included. This would be an impossible task. Even the U.S. Religious Census when it was taken did not attempt to cover all of the hundreds of Protestant sects. However, this study is sufficiently comprehensive. The historical roots of many of the Protestant denominations are traced to their European origins and their development is sketched in American history.

Theologians and priests in the active ministry will have special interest in the author's summaries of the more common doctrinal posi-

tions of the various sectarian families such as the Baptists, who comprise twenty-seven sects. There are difficulties, of course, in dealing with the doctrinal positions of any Protestant group because of the inherent personalism and relativism of the Protestant tradition. When is adherence to a confessional belief nominal and when is it real? A Baptist of one of the Southern churches may speak of Christ as divine. But when he explains that he believes that "God is in Christ," one wonders if it is a "made in the South" type of Nestorianism or sheer Modernism. The study of Protestant confessions is always verbally meaningful, but actual beliefs of the Protestants are better known by person-to-person contacts or surveys. This is a difficult task but it is demanded especially in America by personalism and the spirit of independence of the congregations within the sects. The Melish incident has shown what "episcopal authority" really means to the Episcopalians in real life.

Some Protestants would object to the inclusion of Christian Scientists, Unitarians, and Jehovah's Witnesses among others in the content of American Protestantism. There is no general agreement as to the sects that are genuinely Protestant. The author of a work of this kind can never hope to satisfy all sides on this question.

Father Hardon has answered a definite need in this up-to-date manual. It will be welcomed not only by the clergy but also by the laity. Although covering very complex material, the book is written in a readable style. It is hoped that it will serve as a model to Protestant authors, that they will be as objective in their reports about the Catholic Church as Hardon is in his analysis of their churches.

KENNETH DOUGHERTY, S.A.

TRANSFIGURED WORLD. By Sister M. Laurentia, C.S.J. New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy, Inc., 1957. Pp. 240. $4.00.

From among the many entries to the literary contests for Sisters sponsored by the Thomas More Association and the Farrar, Straus, and Cudahy Publishers, Sister M. Laurentia's work, *Transfigured World,* was judged the best. Sister prefaces her prize winning book with the intention of illuminating the general Catholic reader on the Mass, the Sacraments, the Office, and the year of grace.

To understand the work, we must be aware of the fact that Sister Laurentia, teaching at Mount St. Mary's College, Los Angeles, brings to her opus a rich experience in English, Theology, poetry, and a hobby that includes books on all subjects, people as individuals, and "just looking at the desert of her native Southwest."

The liturgy is a sublime work of art as well as a significant and transforming reality which is necessarily related to the world we see and hear and touch. The significance of these relationships is pointed out in this book so that the new avenues opened will be a source of real transfiguration in Christ which is the aim of all men. Just as you forever enjoy looking at trees after someone has pointed out the "acacia's chartreuse lace, dusty green pulp-thick olive leaves, peppers dangling indolent fronds, the lustrous near-blue magnolia in deep shade" so too the liturgy should live forever and help to transfigure our everyday world and spiritual life.

Since the liturgy is an art form, it should meet the requirements of art principles. To this end the first four chapters of the book study the art qualities of unity, variety, significance, and power. Along with these there is examined with deep artistic feeling the three cardinal principles which function in all art; namely, structure, theme, and symbolism.

With the art principles posited, the second part of the book now applies them to the liturgy. The fifth chapter, the center of the book, very cleverly deals with Christ who is the center of the liturgy around whom the four majestic circles of the Mass, the Sacraments, Divine Office and the liturgical year revolve. Although there is a great amount of dubiously helpful detail in the book, the second part of the book is undoubtedly the better part. Occasionally symbolic relations are presented that do not seem apt, but an adroit use of unusual scriptural texts helps make the symbol clear. One might point out that the chapters on the Mass and Sacraments could be very useful for one's own spiritual transfiguration as well as for a teaching aid for sermons and instructions.

In this book displaying a comprehension of a wide field of knowledge, the first four chapters are overwhelming to this reviewer who is hesitant over the meaning of such terms as epiphanal, revelational, centripetal, and transpatial, and who is unacquainted with the philosophy of art. Both the artist and liturgist, I feel, would have difficulty in uncovering merit buried in a welter of mechanical detail. Because the author has drawn heavily upon books of very recent vintage, (approx. 55 out of 66 reference works) there are some fine modern examples. The

scriptural texts are very interesting, for they are not the traditional ones for the most part. The book is illustrated.

ADAM J. KOSTICK

HOLY WEEK MANUAL FOR SERVERS. By Walter J. Schmitz, S.S., S.T.D. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1957. Pp. iv+64. Fifty cents.

With the recent changes in the liturgy of Holy Week came practical problems of a serious, and sometimes desperate, nature. The priest or sister assigned the task of training the servers for the Holy Week functions needed help. In 1956, Father Schmitz brought out his book on Holy Week (*Holy Week Manual for Priests.* By Walter J. Schmitz, S.S. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1956). It was acclaimed as a valuable addition to the rubrical libraries of priests academically speaking, and a veritable godsend speaking practically. Without it, uniformity probably would have suffered in the celebration of the Holy Week liturgy from parish to parish.

This year, Father Schmitz has brought out a little book which will be, possibly, even more valuable to the persons given the task of training servers for the Holy Week liturgy than last year's larger book. It is a small booklet, paper covered, inexpensive, containing everything the servers must know for the perfect fulfillment of the revised Ordo. It will become, without a doubt, the one book apart from the breviary most used by parish priests from Palm Sunday to Easter.

Two advantages of this little book are precisely that it is small and inexpensive. It is not so expensive that only one copy can be made available in a parish. It will probably be possible to obtain several copies of this booklet for the parish. The priest will want to go over the ceremonies with the servers, especially the older ones, in the book before even setting foot in the sanctuary. The servers can have before them, in black and white, detailed instructions about all their movements during the performance of the liturgy. Instead of having to take notes (which are not always accurate) from the priest instructing them, the altar boys can study their duties in an orderly fashion before the actual rehearsals. Use of Father Schmitz' manual will undoubtedly take much of the drudgery away from the usual Holy Week rehearsals.

The contents of the booklet: Palm Sunday, Holy Thursday, Good Friday, and the Holy Saturday Vigil Service. There are instructions given both for the solemn ceremony and for the ceremony without deacon and subdeacon, so that the needs of all parishes should be supplied by it. It is a book meant for the servers; it does not contain instructions for the deacon and subdeacon, which would probably only confuse the servers. There are special sections for each of the days of Holy Week that deal with the preparations that must be made before each ceremony, with lists of the articles to be placed on the credence table, in the sacristy, in the sanctuary, etc. In addition to the servers' instructions, which are exceptionally clear, there are excellent diagrams which leave nothing to the imagination about the servers' location, the way they are to face in the sanctuary, etc.

In general, this little booklet will be of enormous assistance to the priests and sisters who have anything to do with preparing the altar boys for Holy Week. It will be found valuable, the reviewer is certain, to have several copies available for the servers well before actual rehearsals for Holy Week begin. Its publication will actually make the performance of the New Ordo easier to effect than was the performance of the unrevised liturgy. It will give those who obtain copies of it a sense of security about Holy Week that is sometimes lacking in the rush of details. It will prove to be a very practical guide through the veritable maze of Holy Week rehearsals for the servers for whom it was designed.

JOHN P. WHELAN

IN HIM IS LIFE. By Ernest Mura, F.S.V. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Company, 1956. Pp. 226. $3.75.

In Him Is Life is a summary of the fundamental theology on the Unitive Way. Incorporating basic statements of Scripture, Saint Thomas, and Papal encyclicals, the author traces spiritual progress through union with Christ. He indicates the various aspects of this union in chapters on the liturgy, the Mass, the Eucharist, the Precious Blood, devotion to Mary, and the apostolate. He attempts to place the entire life of the Christian within the framework of the life of Christ.

Father Mura's purpose is worthy and necessary. However, in his text, thickly strewn with quotations, he does not succeed in making